A Monument for the Nation:
the *Australian Encyclopaedia* (1925/26)

Thesis

presented to the Faculty of Arts

of

the University of Zurich

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Nadine Kavanagh

of Baar / Zug

Accepted in the autumn semester 2007 on the recommendation of
Prof. Dr. Madeleine Herren and Prof. Dr. Ian Tyrrell

Sydney
2007

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 3

INTRODUCTION 4

1 THE SOFT POWER OF THE ENCYCLOPAEDIC GENRE 15

1.1 THEORY AND HISTORY OF ENCYCLOPAEDIAS 15
1.2 ENCYCLOPAEDIAS FROM A POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE 22

2 AUSTRALIA AND THE CORE OF NATION BUILDING 29

2.1 THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO NATION BUILDING 29
2.2 DEFINITIONS 30
2.3 MEASURING NATION BUILDING? 31
2.4 FACTORS AND FORCES IN THE AUSTRALIAN NATION BUILDING PROCESS 33
2.5 THE ACHIEVEMENT OF ENCYCLOPAEDIAS 52

3 A NEW MEANING FOR AN OLD GENRE 54

3.1 THE ORIGINS OF THE AUSTRALIAN ENCYCLOPAEDIA 54
3.2 CHAMBERS AS A MODEL FOR THE AUSTRALIAN ENCYCLOPAEDIA 60
3.3 CONCLUSION 117

4 STAGES IN AUSTRALIAN NATION BUILDING 120

4.1 POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE LEMMATA 126
4.2 FREEZING VIEWS 140
4.3 AN INVITATION TO BROWSE? 159
4.4 CONCLUSION 162

5 A WELCOME ADVERTISEMENT FOR AUSTRALIA 164

CONCLUSION 175

BIBLIOGRAPHY 182

CURRICULUM VITAE 198

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to the Forschungskredit of the University of Zurich and the Salomon David Steinberg-Stipendien-Stiftung (Zurich) for their financial support of my thesis. My thanks also go to the University of New South Wales, Sydney, and in particular Prof. Martyn Lyons, who made it possible for me to study at UNSW as a Visiting Research Associate while I wrote my thesis.

I am very grateful to my parents-in-law Paul and Keryl Kavanagh for their wonderful support. Thank you to my mum, Margrit Hagen, and my dad, Roland Hagen, for their love.

I would also like to thank all my friends in Switzerland and Australia, in particular Tanja Hess-Scheiwiler, whose loyal and loving friendship has accompanied me through the writing of this thesis despite the oceans that lie between us.

And last but not least, I would like to thank my husband Morgan Kavanagh. His unconditional love and our many discussions on my research kept me going when work on my thesis was difficult.

Introduction

In 1919 the editor Arthur Wilberforce Jose wrote to the publisher George Robertson to ask him for advice about the procedures he should follow as editor of the *Australian Encyclopaedia (AE)*:

> *We are now up against a problem which may recur in connection with the Encyclopaedia work. When a man has been engaged to do an article, and some of his work is obviously and irrefutably wrong, what is my duty? Do I put it straight, and have the article published as his? or do I leave it wrong and let his signature take the blame? or do we delete his signature and do what we like with the article? In the case of men like Jeffery or Scott there will be no trouble: both are of that decent type that wants its stuff right, and doesn't mind who puts it right. But the immediate case is Collingridge. (...) Now, if this were a magazine article, C. could say what he liked and could be contradicted. But in an Encyclopaedia article that can't be done.*[1]

This letter shows that Jose had recognised an important characteristic of the encyclopaedic genre: in contrast to many other genres, encyclopaedias, like dictionaries, give the air of being both objective and infallible. There are several reasons for this. Most encyclopaedias are written not by one, but by a large number of authors, who are often recognised authorities in their field. In many encyclopaedias the authors remain anonymous, implying that they are giving the consensus view on the topics presented. The style in which encyclopaedia articles are written suggests that they present 'facts'; they contain no questions or formulations that indicate uncertainty.[2] It is in the interest of the producers of encyclopaedias to nurture this air of objectivity. In encyclopaedia prefaces, statements like the following may be found:

> *The CYCLOPAEDIA OF AUSTRALASIA (...) supersedes and renders obsolete all previous books upon the British dominions in the South. It is a complete Australasian Library in itself. It cannot itself be superseded by process of time, since the historical information it contains is of permanent value, and the current (mostly statistical) information can be readily brought up to date at any time with a pen by the possessor of the volume.*[3]

---

[1] Letter from Arthur Wilberforce Jose on 21 July 1919 to George Robertson, Mitchell Library (hereafter ML): MS 314/41.

[2] Paul Michel and Madeleine Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken zu einer Theorie des Enzyklopädischen: Enzyklopädien als Indikatoren für Veränderungen bei der Organisation und der gesellschaftlichen Bedeutung von Wissen', *Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft*, Akten des internationalen Kongresses über Wissenstransfer und enzyklopädische Ordnungssysteme, vom 18. bis 21. September 2003 in Prangins, Paul Michel and Madeleine Herren (eds.) (Project Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft, URL: www.enzyklopaedie.ch, 2005) pp. 52–53.

[3] David Blair, 'Introduction', *Cyclopædia of Australasia; or, Dictionary of Facts, Events, Dates, Persons and Places Connected with the Discovery, Exploration, and Progress of the British Dominions in the South, etc.*, David Blair (ed.) (Fergusson and Moore, Melbourne 1881) p. xi.

The words ‘information’ and ‘permanent’ imply that encyclopaedias contain objective facts beyond the historical process, while ‘complete’ and ‘Library’ suggest exhaustive knowledge above the fluctuations of ‘the current’. Encyclopaedias thus lay claim not only to objectivity, but also to completeness.

This claim is an illusion: knowledge is a construction.[4] Knowledge varies according to social-historical and cultural factors such as the needs, ideals, rulers and fashions of particular times and places.[5] Encyclopaedias, a classic model for the storage of knowledge, reflect this subjectivity in the construction of knowledge. Analysis of encyclopaedias reveals what aspects of knowledge are considered important in a society, what values are being promoted and what areas of knowledge are regarded as taboo.[6] Encyclopaedias are not passive mirrors, but have the power, along with other cultural, artistic and educational products, to subtly control and, paradoxically, to change the societies which produced them.

Considering this political potential of encyclopaedias it is surprising that they have been largely neglected in historical-political research, although they have been examined in various other contexts. Some studies have dealt with encyclopaedias as a literary genre revealing linguistic characteristics; some have discussed encyclopaedias from a lexicographic or library-historical perspective; some have restricted themselves to the analysis of individual encyclopaedias or to particular periods of encyclopaedic production, leaving the political significance of the works treated largely unexplored.[7]

---

[4] The definition of the terms ‘knowledge’, ‘information’ and ‘education’ vary according to different periods and places. There is no clear distinction between them. The terms have in common that they do not signify something that has naturally grown but data that has been pre-selected and pre-formed by the society that stored it. (Michel and Herren, ‘Unvorgreifliche Gedanken’, p. 15.)

[5] Paul Michel and Madeleine Herren, *Projektbeschrieb* (Project Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft, URL: www.enzyklopaedie.ch, accessed 21 Aug. 2005).

[6] Ibid.

[7] See among others: Jacques Berlioz et al.,‘Les Recueils d’Exempla et la diffusion de l’Encyclopédisme médiéval’, *L’enciclopedismo medievale*, Michelangelo Picone (ed.) (Longo, Ravenna 1994) pp. 179–212. – Peter Binkley (ed.), *Pre-modern Encyclopaedic Texts* (Proceedings of the Second COMERS Congress, Groningen 1996) (Brill, Leiden, New York and Köln 1997). – J.A. Hans Bots (ed.), *Critique, savoir et erudition à la veille des Lumières: le* Dictionaire historique et critique *de Pierre Bayle (1647–1706)*, actes du colloque international, Nimège, octobre 1996 (APA-Holland University Press, Amsterdam 1998). – Frank Büttner et al., *Sammeln, Ordnen, Veranschaulichen: Zur Wissenkompilatorik in der Frühen Neuzeit* (LIT Verlag, Münster 2003). – Sylviane Albertan Coppola and Anne-Marie Chouillet (eds.), *La matière et l’homme dans l’Encyclopédie*, actes du colloque de Joinville, 10–12 juillet 1995 (Klincksieck, Paris 1998). – Harvey Einbinder, *The Myth of the Britannica* (Johnson, New York and London 1972). – Monika Estermann, ‘Lexika als biblio-kulturelle Indikatoren’, *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens*, 31, 1988, pp. 247–258. – Franz M. Eybl et al. (eds.), *Enzyklopädien der frühen Neuzeit: Beiträge zu ihrer Erforschung* (Niemeyer, Tübingen 1995). – Fausto Giordano, *Filologi e fascismo: Gli studi di letteratura Latina nell’* Enciclopedia Italiana (Arte Tipografia, Napoli 1993). – Jean Haechler, *L’Encyclopédie: les combats et les*

There are some publications on the topic of encyclopaedias that have got an encyclopaedic or bibliographical character themselves.[8] Finally, there have been a few efforts to give an overview of the history of encyclopaedias, but they have all been brief, and in some cases restricted to periods.[9] Historical research that looks at encyclopaedias on a long-term basis and with a comparative approach is scarce. *Das Streben nach Wissen* by Ulrike Spree, although limited by her almost exclusive dependence on linguistic analysis, is one of very few works that achieves both.[10]

In her study Spree observes that encyclopaedias have often been described as mirrors of the Zeitgeist of the societies they are produced in.[11] This metaphor reveals a

---

hommes (Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1998). – Anke te Heesen, *The World in a Box: the Story of an Eighteenth-Century Picture Encyclopedia* (Chicago University Press, Chicago 2002). – Anja zum Hingst, *Die Geschichte des Grossen Brockhaus: Vom Conversationslexikon zur Enzyklopädie* (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1995). – Franz A. Kafker, *The Encyclopedists as a Group: a Collective Biography of the Authors of the Encyclopédie* (Voltaire Foundation, Oxford 1996). – Christel Meier (ed.), *Die Enzyklopädie im Wandel vom Hochmittelalter bis zur frühen Neuzeit*, Akten des Kolloquiums des Projekts D im Sonderforschungsbereich 231: Träger, Felder, Formen Pragmatischer Schriftlichkeit im Mittelalter (29.11.–1.12. 1996) (Fink, München 2002). – Georg Meyer, *Das Konversations-Lexikon, eine Sonderform der Enzyklopädie: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bildungsverbreitung in Deutschland* (unpublished PhD thesis, Göttingen 1965). – Warren E. Preece, 'The Organization of Knowledge and the Planning of Encyclopaedias: The Case of the Encyclopaedia Britannica', *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale*, 9 (3) (1966) pp. 798–818. – Bernard Ribémont, *Littérature et encyclopédies du Moyen Age* (Paradigme, Orléans 2002). – Jonathan Sheehan, 'From Philology to Fossils: the Biblical Encyclopedia in Early Modern Europe', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64 (1), 2003, pp. 41–61. – Theo Stammen and Wolfgang E.J. Weber (eds.), *Wissenssicherung, Wissensordnung und Wissensverarbeitung* (Akademie Verlag, Berlin 2004). – Michael Stolz, *Artes-liberales-Zyklen: Formationen des Wissens im Mittelalter* (Francke, Tübingen 2004). – Richard Yeo, *Encyclopaedic Visions: Scientific Dictionaries and Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001). – Richard Yeo, 'Reading Encyclopedias: Science and the Organization of Knowledge in British Dictionaries of Arts and Sciences, 1730–1850', *Isis*, 82 (311), 1991, pp. 24–49. – Richard Yeo, 'A Solution to the Multitude of Books: Ephraim Chambers's Cyclopaedia (1728) as "The Best Book in the Universe"', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64 (1), 2003, pp. 61–72. – Carsten Zelle, *Enzyklopädien, Lexika und Wörterbücher im 18. Jahrhundert* (Wallstein-Verlag, Wolfenbüttel 1998).

[8] Robert Collison, *Encyclopaedias: their History throughout the Ages*, A Bibliographical Guide with Extensive Historical Notes to the General Encyclopaedias Issued throughout the World from 350 B.C. to the Present Day, 2nd edn. (Hafner, New York and London 1966). – Werner Lenz, *Kleine Geschichte grosser Lexika* (Bertelsmann Lexikon-Verlag, Güthersloh 1972). – Heinz Sarkowski, *Das Bibliographische Institut: Verlagsgeschichte und Bibliographie, 1826–1976* (Bibliographisches Institut, Mannheim, Wien and Zürich 1976). – Friedrich Schultheiss, 'Bibliographische Anmerkungen zu einer Enzyklopädie und vier Lexika des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts (Ersch-Gruber, Brockhaus, Pierer, Meyer, Herder)', *Die wissenschaftliche Redaktion*, 6, 1971, pp. 33–48. – Hugo Wetscherek et al. (ed.) *Bibliotheca lexicorum: kommentiertes Verzeichnis der Sammlung Otmar Seemann*, eine Bibliographie der enzyklopädischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der im deutschen Sprachraum ab dem Jahr 1500 gedruckten Werke (Inlibris, Wien 2001). – Gert A. Zischka, *Index Lexicorum: Bibliographie der lexikalischen Nachschlagewerke* (Hollinek, Wien 1959).

[9] See for example: Carol Gluck, 'The Fine Folly of the Encyclopedists', *Biblion*, 3 (1), 1994, pp. 5–48. – S. Jackson, 'Towards a History of the Encyclopedia from Jerome to Isidor', *International Library Review*, 13 (1), 1981, pp. 3–16. – Lenz, *Kleine Geschichte*.

[10] Ulrike Spree, *Das Streben nach Wissen: Eine vergleichende Gattungsgeschichte der populären Enzyklopädie in Deutschland und Grossbritannien im 19. Jahrhundert* (Niemeyer, Tübingen 2000).

[11] Spree, *Das Streben*, p. 13. – See for example: Karsten Behrndt, *Die Nationskonzeptionen in deutschen und britischen Enzyklopädien und Lexika im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Lang, Frankfurt am Main et al. 2003).

lack of understanding of the complex politics embedded in encyclopaedias. Clorinda Donato in her essay *Eighteenth-Century Encyclopedias and National Identity* examines encyclopaedias from a historical as well as a political perspective, but her analysis is very brief and is restricted to the eighteenth century.[12] In recent years, historian Madeleine Herren and Germanist Paul Michel, having recognised this research gap, founded the research group *Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft: Enzyklopädien als Indikatoren für Veränderungen der gesellschaftlichen Bedeutung von Wissen, Bildung und Information* (General Knowledge and Society: Encyclopaedias as Indicators of Change in the Social Significance of Knowledge, Education and Information), based at the University of Zurich. As the name of the research group indicates, its members consider the social significance of encyclopaedias and thus establish the link between general knowledge and society.[13] Their research focuses on the way the knowledge is chosen, ordered and presented to encyclopaedia users, the political context of each encyclopaedia being crucial.[14] In geographical terms the research project concentrates on European encyclopaedias.

I have set out to widen this focus by applying a political approach to encyclopaedias from another continent, namely Australia. The circumstances in which the Australian nation came about make Australia an interesting case for the research on encyclopaedias. In contrast to the American nation, the Australian Commonwealth was not born in a war. The foundation of the Australian nation came about in a much less revolutionary manner, simply by proclamation in Centennial Park, Sydney, in 1901. Roslyn Russell and Philip Chubb describe the act that brought the Australian colonies together as a nation:

> *A stiff breeze fluttered the robes of the Archbishop of Sydney, William Saumarez Smith, as he stood at the top of the steps of the white-plastered pavilion on a slight rise in Centennial Park. Towards him walked the slim figure of Lord Hopetoun, accompanied by his private secretary, Captain Wallington, and by Rear-Admiral Pearson. At the foot of the steps Sir William*

[12] Clorinda Donato, 'Eighteenth-Century Encyclopedias and National Identity', *History of European Ideas*, 16 (4–6), 1993, pp. 959–965. Another brief study that puts an encyclopaedia in its political context is: Vincent Chambarlhac, 'L'Encyclopédie Socialiste, une forme singulière pour une cause politique?', *Genèses: Sciences Sociales et Histoire*, 57 (4), 2004, pp. 4–22.

[13] Project Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft, URL: www.enzyklopaedie.ch. See especially their publication: Michel and Herren (eds.), *Allgemeinwissen und* Gesellschaft. See also: Ines Prodöhl, '"Aus denen besten Scribenten": Zedlers *Universal-Lexicon* im Spannungsfeld zeitgenössischer Lexikonproduktion', *Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert*, 29 (1), 2005, pp. 82–94.

[14] See also: Paul Michel, 'Ordnungen des Wissens: Darbietungsweisen des Materials in Enzyklopädien', *Populäre Enzyklopädien: Von der Auswahl, Ordnung und Vermittlung des Wissens*, Ingrid Tomkowiak (ed.) (Chronos, Zürich 2002) pp. 35–83.

> *Lyne, as Premier of New South Wales, greeted the governor-general, and at 1 pm the two men entered the pavilion and were greeted by the Lieutenant-Governor of New South Wales, Sir Frederick Darley. (...) In the centre of the pavilion stood an ornate table and a silver inkstand – the items used by Queen Victoria when she signed the Bill that was to bring the Australian Commonwealth into being. Now they were to be used again. After the choirs had sung a hymn and the archbishop had read two prayers – one composed by the Governor of South Australia, Lord Tennyson, who was in Adelaide presiding over federation celebrations in his own state – and the business of reading out the various proclamations, letters patent and oaths of office had been concluded, Lord Hopetoun signed the proclamation at Queen Victoria's table. The Commonwealth of Australia was now inaugurated.*[15]

This scene is reminiscent of the christening of a child in a peaceful outdoors setting, but we should not be misled. The calm attending the act that founded the Australian nation did not mean that federation had been fully supported by the Australian people. Voting polls show that the public was not enthusiastic about federation. Only 60% of all qualified electors voted in the final referendum of 1899–1900, a lower percentage than was usual when voting was not yet compulsory in Australia. Of these voters, only 72% voted for federation as proposed.[16] The results of federation were by no means unity and harmony. Rivalry between the states continued and many people felt that the economic ramifications of federation were not just. Several institutions were created to deal with state complaints.[17] It is important to note that the Australian Commonwealth was exclusive. Many people, first and foremost Australia's indigenous population, were officially excluded from the newly founded Australian nation. They had no say in the question of federation and were denied civil rights after the foundation of the Australian Commonwealth.

The story of the foundation of the Australian nation demonstrates that nations cannot be built through isolated political acts. Nations must be constructed as well, or – as Benedict Anderson put it – they must be imagined.[18] But how could the people living in Australia imagine themselves as a national community distinct from Britain? The large majority of the Australian population at federation was of British descent and this had not

[15] Roslyn Russell and Philip Chubb, *One destiny!: the Federation Story – how Australia Became a Nation* (Penguin, Ringwood (VIC) 1998) pp. 273–274.
[16] John Manning Ward, *The State and the People: Australian Federation and Nation-Making, 1870–1901*, Deryck M. Schreuder and Brian H. Fletcher (eds.) (Federation Press, Sydney 2001) p. 53.
[17] Stephen Alomes and Catherine Jones, *Australian Nationalism: a Documentary History* (Collins and Angus & Robertson, North Ryde (NSW) 1991) p. 219.
[18] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. edn. (Verso, London and New York 1991).

changed by the 1920s.[19] Australia did not inherit a unique defining history and culture, the yeast in the dough of new nations. In this respect, Australia resembled what became the United States of America; but the Americans could resort to something else in the proving of their nationhood, namely a foundation myth. The unspectacular coming about of the Australian Commonwealth did not provide the Australian people with such a myth. No architectural monuments were erected to remind the Australian people of the founding of their nation.[20]

For this reason, Australians interested in forging an Australian national identity had to find other means to that purpose. The *Australian Encyclopaedia* (1925/26), published by Sydney based publisher Angus & Robertson, a company intent on creating a literature for Australia, provided such a means.[21] The *AE*, consisting of two volumes, was the first general Australian encyclopaedia, not restricted to a specific topic, published after federation. The encyclopaedia's title did not necessarily indicate that it was only to deal with matters Australian. As Robert Collison observed, national encyclopaedias usually come in two types, the first of which deals with the world scene, the second with the country in which it is produced. Indeed the latter type would be expected to bear the title 'Encyclopaedia of Australia' rather than 'Australian Encyclopaedia'.[22] However, the *AE* did not follow on this line of thinking.

Work on the *AE* had already begun before the First World War, but the war and various other complications seriously delayed publication. Although the *AE* lists 120 contributing authors, many respected authorities in their fields, the *AE* clearly bears the imprint of two powerful men. The publisher George Robertson and the editor Arthur Wilberforce Jose had a strong influence on their authors and the final shape, content and 'spin' of the encyclopaedia. Herbert James Carter, the *AE's* other editor, was an entomologist, and his role in the production of the encyclopaedia seems to have been

[19] According to the *Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia* of 1925, in 1921 5,387,205 people living in Australia were of British origin (compared to the total of 5,435,735, excluding 'full-blood Aboriginals'). (Chas. H. Wickens, *Official Yearbook of the Commonwealth of Australia*, no. 18, John Stonham (ed.) (Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Melbourne 1925) pp. 894 and 921.
[20] Marilyn Lake, 'Introduction: the Past in the Present', *Memory, Monuments and Museums: The Past in the Present*, Marilyn Lake (ed.) (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 2006) p. 5.
[21] Arthur Wilberforce Jose and Herbert James Carter (eds.), *The Australian Encyclopaedia* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1925/26). The first volume of the *AE* was published under the title *The Illustrated Australian Encyclopaedia*.
[22] Robert Collison, 'Encyclopaedia', *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 6, 15th edn. (Benton, Chicago et al. 1984) p. 793. – Encyclopaedias have only been consulted as secondary sources for my study where other secondary sources were rare or where scientific subjects were concerned.

mainly that of a scientific adviser. There is ample evidence to show that the *AE's* construct of general knowledge and the construct of the Australian nation were linked to one another.

Much has been written on the topic of nations and nationalism in general and specifically on the Australian nation building process.[23] However the role of encyclopaedias in the Australian nation building process has been neglected. Research on Australian encyclopaedias is still in its infancy. They have mainly been analysed in the context of literature and book history, an approach led by the Australian historian Martyn Lyons with publications such as *A History of the Book in Australia*.[24] Teresa Pagliaro's case study on the *AE* is an example of this approach.[25] Caroline Jones, who in her PhD thesis on George Robertson does put the *AE* in the nation building context, only regards it as a passive mirror of political forces rather than as a political force itself.[26]

The scarcity of research done on Australian encyclopaedias stands in stark contrast to an excellent source situation. The National Library in Canberra and the Mitchell Library in Sydney hold a great treasure of sources on the production of the *AE*. Letters between Jose, Carter and Robertson as well as correspondence between members of Angus & Robertson and various authors of the *AE* give the historian a rare insight into the production of an encyclopaedia.[27] Business records of Angus & Robertson and reminiscences of George Robertson's secretary Rebecca Wiley supplement this unique collection of sources.[28] The Mitchell Library also has a collection of letters of acknowledgement for complimentary copies of the *AE*. These sources provide the

[23] See chapter two.
[24] Martyn Lyons and John Arnold (eds.), *A History of the Book in Australia, 1891–1945: a National Culture in a Colonised Market* (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) and Portland (Or.) 2001). – See also: David Walker et al. (eds.), *Books, Readers, Reading* (Deaking University, Geelong (VIC) 1992).
[25] Teresa Pagliaro, 'A. W. Jose and the *Australian Encyclopaedia*', Lyons and Arnold (eds.), *A History of the Book*, pp. 42–49.
[26] Caroline Viera Jones, *Australian Imprint: The Influence of George Robertson on a National Narrative (1890–1935)* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sydney 2004).
[27] See: National Library of Australia (NLA): MS 708, Letters and Papers Relating to the Publication of the Australian Encyclopaedia 1917–1928. – ML: MS 314/41, Publishing Files of Arthur Wilberforce Jose. – ML: MS 314/17, Publishing Files of Herbert James Carter. – ML: MS 314/242, Angus & Robertson, publishers, correspondence (on Australian Encyclopaedia, 1925–1930). – ML: ZML A7273, Jose, Arthur Wilberforce and Carter, Herbert James: Files of correspondence (17 letters), 1917–1925, as editors of the 1925–1926 edition of the Australian Encyclopaedia.
[28] ML: MS 3269, box 19, folder 42/2, Business Records of Angus & Robertson: Chamber's Encyclopaedia, 1902–1913. – ML: MS 5238, Rebecca Wiley, Reminiscences of George Robertson and Angus & Robertson Ltd. 1894–1938.

historian with information about how the *AE* was received.[29] Some of the most valuable documents for the historiography of encyclopaedias, however, are held by the Australian War Memorial in Canberra: among Jose's papers, there are several taxonomies listing themes to be treated in the *AE*.[30] Although these taxonomies are not complete and have the character of a work in progress, they nevertheless enable a historian of encyclopaedias to draw conclusions about the way knowledge was chosen and ordered, an essential aspect of the power of an encyclopaedia (see chapter one).

The wealth of sources on the production of the *AE* is unique: nothing comparable has been detected so far in the context of European encyclopaedias. This uniqueness rules out the possibility of drawing comparisons between similar bodies of sources. By definition, all of the above mentioned sources, in particular the correspondence and Wiley's reminiscences, are highly subjective. The tone used in Wiley's reminiscences leaves no doubt that Wiley was interested in casting a positive light on her former employer and possibly on herself. George Robertson may well have extracted documents from the company records that he did not want posteriority to read. Remarks Robertson made in some of the correspondence show that he was well aware that the Angus & Robertson papers would finally go to the Mitchell Library.[31] Because comparisons with similar sources cannot be conducted, comparisons within the same stock of sources (on the production of the *AE*) have to be made to reduce the subjectivity of the sources as much as possible.

This unique set of accessible sources allows me to answer a number of questions of specific and general relevance to current research on encyclopaedias. The first two chapters of this study are preparatory, and provide some theoretical deliberation on the nature of encyclopaedias and a general assessment of the Australian nation building process. In chapters three, four and five I will address the following questions: was the construction of the Australian nation connected with a change in general knowledge? was the knowledge contained in the *AE* adapted to the image of the new Australian nation after the federation of the Australian colonies? was the *AE* designed to strengthen the

[29] ML: MSS 314/242 and 314/243, Angus & Robertson, publishers, correspondence (on Australian Encyclopaedia, 1925–1930).
[30] Taxonomies over the science sections: National Archives of Australia (NAA): AWM 39, 3 and 4. – Taxonomy over the sections on social and economic science: NAA: AWM 39, 3.
[31] See for example: Letter from George Robertson on 19 November 1928 to C.H. Bertie, ML: MS 314/12. Note also that Robertson sometimes wrote comments on some of the letters he received (See: Telegram of Jose (date illegible) to Robertson, ML: MS 314/41.

national image of Australia towards the inside and the outside, and, if so, was it successful?

To find the answers to these questions three steps are required. The first step will determine to what extent Australian general knowledge presented after federation was independent from British general knowledge (chapter three). Correspondence between Jose and some of the authors of the *AE* shows that the encyclopaedia was originally planned to be a supplement to the Scottish produced *Chambers's Encyclopaedia* (not to be confused with Ephraim Chambers' *Cyclopaedia*).[32] Although the supplement function was not pursued consistently, *Chambers* was clearly chosen as a model for the *AE*. Between 1925 and 1927 a new edition of *Chambers* was published, and thus produced around the same time as the *AE*.[33] Jose was involved not only in the production of the *AE*, but also in that edition of *Chambers*: he re-wrote old and produced new articles dealing with Australia, supplied additional sections for articles concerned with Australia, and also made quite a few suggestions for articles written by other authors. Correspondence between Jose and the publishers W & R Chambers provides evidence of Jose's involvement in the Scottish encyclopaedia.[34] So to what extent was the knowledge presented in *Chambers* entangled with the one contained in the *AE*? This formulation of the question implies a postcolonial approach. The centre of the British empire (Britain) exerted overt cultural power over the periphery, its former colonies in Australia; but what influence did the periphery exert over the centre? My approach is transnational. National histories are never independent from other national histories, and many aspects of a national history can only be explained by looking at the wider frame of transnational entanglements.

In a second step, the knowledge in the *AE* has to be compared with the encyclopaedic general knowledge published in the Australian colonies before federation (chapter 4). Was the way of presenting knowledge in the *AE* – its planning, presentation, order and content – different from general knowledge contained in Australian encyclopaedias published before federation? If so, in what respect? A comparison of the

[32] See for example: Letter from Jose on 11 September 1923 to S.H. Ray, NLA: MS 708.
[33] David Patrick and William Geddie (eds.), *The Illustrated Chambers's Encyclopaedia: A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge*, new edn. (W&R Chambers, London, Edinburgh and Sydney 1925–1927). – The British edition of the encyclopaedia was published between 1923 and 1926.
[34] See: NAA, Official History, 1914–18 War: AWM39, Records of Arthur W Jose, 1910–1925, 6, Correspondence between A W Jose, Chambers' Encyclopedia, J M Dent and others, 1910–1921. – And: National Library of Scotland (NLS): Dep. 341, W & R Chambers Papers.

AE with John Henniker Heaton's *Australian Dictionary of Dates and Men of the Time* can provide an answer to these questions.[35] Heaton's work was the first Australian encyclopaedia produced in Australia. It was published in 1879, shortly before the cultural and political nation building is said to have become important in the Australian colonies.[36] For this reason, Heaton's *Dictionary* is perfect for comparison with the *AE*.

The third and last step will be to discover whether the *AE's* way of presenting knowledge was successful (chapter five). Did Australians and people in other parts of the world trust and use the encyclopaedia? What was the general view on the *AE*? The letters of acknowledgement from recipients of complimentary copies shed light on these questions. By definition the acknowledgement letters all came from the specific group within society that Robertson had chosen for his complimentary copies – academics, librarians, people in leading positions in museums, publishers, politicians and so on. The letters are not representative of the general population, but of well-educated people in leading positions. Nevertheless, this unique stock of sources also gives clues about to the reception of the *AE* by the general reader.

Unlike many other single publications of the time, the *AE* is an ideal indicator for the questions I have posed. As an encyclopaedia it was supposed to be a complete collection of general knowledge, and its air of objectivity and the large number printed – 10,000 copies for a population of less than six million – made it highly influential.[37] Analysis of the *AE* will also enable me to draw some general conclusions about attitudes among the Australian population. Since the *AE* was produced by a private company rather than being supported by the state, it needed to tap into a widely felt need in order to be successful. And successful it was, as will be shown in chapter five.

This study is thus designed to show how a private company answered a widely felt Australian need to fill a hole in the construction of the Australian nation. It shall be demonstrated how the encyclopaedic genre proved to be the ideal choice to reach that

---

[35] John Henniker Heaton, *Australian Dictionary of Dates and Men of the Time: Containing the History of Australasia from 1542 to Date* (George Robertson, Sydney 1879). In this study, the electronic edition of the *Dictionary*, published by Archive CD Books Australia in 2005, is used.

[36] Stephen Alomes, *A Nation at Last? The Changing Character of Australian Nationalism 1880–1988* (Angus & Robertson, North Ryde (NSW) 1988) p. 13.

[37] According to the census, in 1921 the Australian population (excluding 'full-blood Aboriginals') had reached 5,435,734 people. In 1924, the population was still estimated to be below 6 million. See: Wickens, *Official Yearbook*, p. 894. – For the high edition of the *AE* see: Richard Nile and David Walker, 'The Mystery of the Missing Bestseller', Lyons and Arnold (eds.), *A History of the Book in Australia,* p. 250.

purpose. The *AE* was a purpose-built cultural product which can only be fully understood when it is set in its political context. Careful examination of this antipodean example should also bring us a step or two forward in the process of de–mythologizing the genre: Encyclopaedia.[38]

[38] For the myths of the encyclopaedic genre see: Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 58.

1 The Soft Power of the Encyclopaedic Genre

1.1 Theory and History of Encyclopaedias

What are encyclopaedias? Can they be defined as a genre? In *Das Streben nach Wissen* (The Quest for Knowledge) Ulrike Spree attempts to uncover characteristics of encyclopaedias as a literary genre by linguistic methods and comes to the conclusion that one cannot distinguish a genre of encyclopaedias by their characteristics of content and language.[39] Paul Michel and Madeleine Herren – having recognised that encyclopaedias, being cultural constructs and not scientific objects, cannot be defined through a fixed set of characteristics – observe that family-likeness is a more adequate concept for describing encyclopaedias.[40] Encyclopaedias are best defined as having a number of central characteristics, some of which may be missing in an individual work. Encyclopaedias are regarded to be texts that possess the following core characteristics:

- Encyclopaedias claim to be comprehensive.
- Encyclopaedias claim to be an ordered exhibition of knowledge. The knowledge is organised according to specific principles.
- Encyclopaedias are designed to be consulted, not read as a whole.
- Encyclopaedias claim to provide their users with socially relevant knowledge.
- Encyclopaedias claim to be objective.
- Encyclopaedias give the impression that they are comprehensible without any prior specialist knowledge.
- Encyclopaedias are mostly compilations of knowledge (second hand knowledge) and thus cut off the stored knowledge from its production.
- Encyclopaedias do not give direct instructions but claim to show an existing reality.
- There are (more or less conceded) profound aims behind encyclopaedias.[41]

These claims and characteristics are sometimes implied in an encyclopaedia, sometimes made explicit by the producers, for example in the preface. This concept of family-likeness allows Michel and Herren to argue for an open definition of the encyclopaedia.

[39] Spree, *Das Streben*, p. 325.
[40] Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 3.
[41] Ibid. pp. 3–6.

There are numerous works not called 'encyclopaedia' by their producers – but something like 'mirror', 'collection', 'dictionary' or 'lexicon' – that correspond to the above concept. On the other hand not every work bearing the term 'encyclopaedia' in its title matches this definition.

It follows from what Michel and Herren say that there must be encyclopaedias that are more prototypical than others. It is these works, such as the French *Encyclopédie*, the German *Brockhaus* and the British *Britannica*, that in the history of encyclopaedias have reached the status of a model which later encyclopaedists emulated.[42] Even though the term 'encyclopaedia' is of modern origin – the metaphor of the circle into which general knowledge is rounded is a humanist interpretation of a Greek word –,[43] the idea behind encyclopaedias can be traced back to second century B.C. China in the East and to ancient Greece in the West.[44] For example, Homer's 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey' could be called encyclopaedic because they embodied the complete knowledge of the Greeks at the time. But the first conscious encyclopaedic approach in Western society has to be ascribed to Aristotle. In his opinion all knowledge together formed one entity. The succeeding encyclopaedic works either pursued Aristotle's approach or set up a counter model by specialising and dividing knowledge into different sections.

In the second and third century AD a special type of encyclopaedia developed, the collection of 'mirabilia', i.e. phenomena that could not be explained scientifically. This kind of encyclopaedia made its way through to the Middle Ages.[45] Apart from these collections, the medieval period saw the production of several very famous encyclopaedias. Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Majus* of 1244, an anthology that drew from different cultures by combining Aristotle's ideas, Christian theology and Arab science, was one of them.[46] The protoypes of medieval encyclopaedias though were Cassiodore's *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum* and Isidore's

[42] See also: Spree, *Das Streben*, p. 326.
[43] Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 50. – See also: Klaus Vogelsang, 'Zum Begriff "Enzyklopädie"', *Wissenssicherung, Wissensordnung und Wissensverarbeitung*, Theo Stammen and Wolfgang E.J. Weber (eds.) (Akademie Verlag, Berlin 2004) pp. 15–23.
[44] For the East see: Gluck, 'The Fine Folly', p. 13. For the West see for example: Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (eds.), 'Enzyklopädie', *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 3 (Metzler, Stuttgart and Weimar 1997) p. 1054.
[45] Cancik and Schneider, 'Enzyklopädie', vol 3, pp. 1055–1057.
[46] Gluck, 'The Fine Folly', p. 7.

Etymologiae, both produced in the early middle ages. These works were attempts to describe the human belief in and knowledge about the world order created by God.[47]

The modern European encyclopaedia developed in the eighteenth century. Francis Bacon had prepared the ground for it by classifying knowledge in an entirely new way, concentrating on the scientific instead of the sacred.[48] By the eighteenth century it was common to arrange knowledge in alphabetical instead of systematic order.[49] The first purely English general encyclopaedia, the *Lexicon technicum*, compiled by John Harris, was released in 1704.[50] Five years later, Noël Chomel published his *Dictionnaire Oeconomique*, a French encyclopaedia that was to become one of the most translated encyclopaedias of all times. Translations and adaptions appeared in English, German, Dutch, Swedish as well as Japanese. The main reason for this global success may be seen in the scope of Chomel's work, comprising knowledge that was largely independent from individual states or religions, including global knowledge gained through and focussing on long-distance trade. This 'foreign' knowledge was shaped to a large degree by European perceptions and made to fit European ordering principles. The translations and adaptions concentrated more and more on knowledge that was relevant for the encyclopaedia's local context.[51]

The title 'father of the modern encyclopaedia' is usually applied to Ephraim Chambers, who published his *Cyclopaedia* in 1728.[52] Chambers' work preceded and was the model for the famous French *Encyclopédie* by Diderot and d'Alembert that was launched in 1751. In the history of encyclopaedias, the *Encyclopédie* was the first encyclopaedia to assume an intellectual leading role in society. It had a clear political aim: Diderot and d'Alembert wanted to enlighten its readers and thereby cleared the ground for the French revolution.[53] Following the example of Pierre Bayle in his *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (first edition 1696/97), they applied critical method to

[47] Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 10.
[48] See: Gluck, 'The Fine Folly', p. 7.
[49] Ibid. p. 8.
[50] Collison, *Encyclopaedias*, p. 99.
[51] Madeleine Herren and Ines Prodöhl, 'Kapern mit Orangenblüten – die globale Welt der Enzyklopädie', *Seine Welt wissen: Enzyklopädien in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Ulrich Johannes Schneider (ed.) (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 2006). pp. 42–53.
[52] Collison, *Encyclopaedias*, p. 103.
[53] Jürgen Mittelstrass, 'Vom Nutzen der Enzyklopädie', *Meyers enzyklopädisches Lexikon*, vol. 1 (Bibliographisches Institut, Mannheim 1971) p. XII.

the collection of knowledge.[54] Interestingly, the publication of the *Encyclopédie* led to the emergence of many nationally oriented encyclopaedias in other countries, for even though the *Encyclopédie* was an important role model, its condescending tone towards other countries irked many people outside of France.[55] So, for example, in 1758 Ottaviano Diodati, a Lucchese nobleman, edited a reprint of the *Encyclopédie*, 'augmented with copious notes' in order to 'rectify' the information on Italy given in the original *Encyclopédie*.[56]

The Scotsmen Andrew Bell, an engraver, and Colin Macfarquhar, a printer, inspired by the success of the *Encyclopédie*, published the first edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1768, employing William Smellie as the editor.[57] The declared purpose of this encyclopaedia was utility, the main emphasis thus being on practical topics.[58] The producers of the *Britannica* tried to solve the problem that had emerged with the flourishing of the encyclopaedic dictionary in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Traditionally, these encyclopaedias were either mainly concerned with history and biography or with arts and sciences, the divisions not always being clear-cut. The encyclopaedic dictionary with its numerous brief entries brought with it an extreme fragmentation of knowledge. The *Britannica* met this problem by including a number of long general articles that allowed readers to put the shorter entries into a larger context.[59]

In contrast to the *Encyclopédie*, the *Britannica* was not intended to change the social order.[60] Later, the editor of the third edition of the *Britannica* prided himself that the work was supposedly a conveyer of information rather than of ideas or morality.[61] In the early nineteenth century, like other British encyclopaedias, the *Britannica* published many scientific articles containing the results of original research.[62] The producers of the *Britannica* aimed to elevate the encyclopaedia above partiality.[63] Nevertheless, in the

[54] Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 11.
[55] Donato, 'Eighteenth-Century Encyclopedias', p. 960.
[56] Ibid. p. 963.
[57] Einbinder, *Britannica*, p. 29.
[58] Ibid. p. 31.
[59] Robert Collison, 'Encyclopaedia', *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 6, 15th edn.(Benton, Chicago et al. 1984) pp. 789–790.
[60] Einbinder, *Britannica*, p. 33.
[61] Preece, 'The Organization of Knowledge', p. 801.
[62] Einbinder, *Britannica*, pp. 33–34.
[63] Preece, 'The Organization of Knowledge', p. 808.

nineteenth century there was a general trend in the production of encyclopaedias to put the nation of origin in the centre when deciding which knowledge to include.[64]

Even though various other encyclopaedias were produced in the English-speaking world after the launch of the *Britannica*, in the nineteenth century it established itself as the ultimate role model for encyclopaedias written in English. Harvey Einbinder ascribes this to 'the *Britannica*'s unbroken continuity, its famous contributors and commercial success'.[65] Angus & Robertson, however, did not follow the tradition of the *Britannica*, but chose *Chambers's Encyclopaedia* by W & R Chambers in Edinburgh as role model for their *AE*.[66] The first edition of *Chambers's Encyclopaedia* had appeared in 1860–1868 and was an adapted version of Brockhaus' *Conversations-Lexicon*.[67] Thus the *AE* stood in the tradition of another branch of encyclopaedias: the German Konversationslexikon. Whereas in the eighteenth century, generally speaking, encyclopaedias were supposed to be useful, their main purpose being to spread knowledge or to record the current 'state of knowledge' for coming generations, by the early nineteenth century the specific needs of the readers were considered to be important.[68] The knowledge presented in the encyclopaedias was chosen according to its perceived usefulness in conversation, as encyclopaedias were supposed to enable their readers to prove themselves in society.[69] From 1808 Arnold Brockhaus edited his *Conversations-Lexicon*, a project begun by the Leipzig scholar Renatus Gotthelf Löbel.[70] The encyclopaedia was a great success. Although in Britain, the name 'Conversations-Lexicon' only became known in the 1840s with the various translations of Brockhaus' work, the British encyclopaedias that were published in the beginning of the century were already showing a change of the genre too, incorporating a notion of conversation.[71] In the second half of the nineteenth century, there were mainly two types of encyclopaedias in Germany and in Britain: one type aimed to record isolated facts, the other one, like the *Britannica*, aimed to document and

[64] Spree, *Das Streben*, p. 298.
[65] Einbinder, *Britannica*, p. 30. See also: Spree, *Das Streben*, p. 155.
[66] See for example: Letter from Jose on 25 October 1921 to Walter Baldwin Spencer, NLA: MS 708.
[67] *Conversations-Lexicon oder Handwörterbuch für die gebildeten Stände*, 10th edn. (Brockhaus, Leipzig 1852). (See: Spree, *Das Streben*, p. 293.)
[68] Spree, *Das Streben*, pp. 32 and 56.
[69] Mittelstrass, 'Vom Nutzen', p. XVI.
[70] Collison, *Encyclopaedias*, pp. 156–157.
[71] Spree, *Das Streben*, pp. 269–286.

push scientific progress, thus displaying connections and interrelationships. The encyclopaedias of the time were situated between these two extremes.[72]

Generally speaking, towards the end of the nineteenth century, encyclopaedias were made to look more and more objective by keeping quiet about the values, norms and sources the works were based on.[73] What is more, from about 1850, prefaces in British encyclopaedias did not make explicit which other encyclopaedias had been used as role models.[74] In modern encyclopaedias, the knowledge presented is usually completely cut off from its original context, as Jürgen Mittelstrass explains:

> *das faktische Wissen, ausgebreitet in allen Details, wenn auch ohne die in dieser Form nicht mehr referierbaren Begründungszusammenhänge, wird von allen anderen als den durch dieses Wissen selbst definierten Zielen oder Zwecken abgeschnitten.*
>
> *(The actual knowledge, spread out in all its details, although without the causal context that cannot be referred to anymore in this form, is cut off from all aims or purposes other than is defined through this knowledge.)*[75]

Even though no role model is mentioned in the preface of the *AE*, many of its sources are revealed. Apart from the bibliographical information provided in many of the individual articles, a general overview is given in the preface:

> *The utmost possible use has been made of original documents, especially of those contemporaneous with the events they describe; and for most of these we are indebted to the magnificent collection housed in the Mitchell Library at Sydney. Our work has been greatly facilitated, also, by the existence of two invaluable Commonwealth publications – the* Historical Records of Australia, *and* the Official Year Book of the Commonwealth.[76]

The editors of the *AE* also give some clues in the preface concerning the aims and values of the encyclopaedia. The beginning of the preface might, however, lead the reader on the wrong track: one is told that the encyclopaedia was originally projected in 1912 'as a historical and biographical record', that they later decided 'to include articles on scientific subjects also' and that the scientific articles were 'in many instances, the first trustworthy summaries yet published of scientific knowledge previously accessible only in the journals of learned societies'.[77] These introductory remarks might mislead the

[72] Ibid. pp. 46–48.
[73] Ibid. p. 325.
[74] Ibid. pp. 287–288.
[75] Mittelstrass, 'Vom Nutzen', p. XIX. Translation into English by Nadine Kavanagh (in the following N.K.).
[76] Jose and Carter (eds.), *Australian Encyclopaedia*, vol. 1, p. v.
[77] Ibid.

reader to think that the main purpose of the *AE* was to provide – alongside historical and biographical details – a platform for scientific publication, thus lining up with the *Britannica* of the early nineteenth century. Certainly, the *AE* does display a lot of scientific, especially biological, articles and one could indeed get lost in the great amount of scientific detail. But this is just what is visible at the surface of the work. If one has a closer look at the encyclopaedia as a whole, a deeper purpose emerges. The last sentence of the *AE's* preface gives a hint of the producers' real aim: 'We take pride in publishing an encyclopaedia conceived, written, edited, printed and produced entirely within the Commonwealth of Australia (…).'[78] The national pride cannot be missed. Displaying national pride in encyclopaedias had been common in Europe since the eighteenth century and many encyclopaedias were designed to construct and spread a national culture.[79] Between 1870 and 1914, in the time of high imperialism and 'nation building', when the encyclopaedia was more and more meant to be an instrument of education rather than an aide for conversation, the Konversationslexikon reached its peak.[80] The *AE*'s display of national pride thus integrates itself nicely in the European tradition. But the *AE* stands out in two significant ways. Firstly, as laid out in the introduction, the *AE* was produced by a private company, not supported by the state, as was the case with national encyclopaedias of many other countries, and thus reliant on the support of the public. Secondly, whereas typically European encyclopaedias would include articles about other countries,[81] the *AE* only included terms that were significant for the Australian nation.

This strategy of choosing knowledge points to an important characteristic of encyclopaedias. Much more than any other genre, encyclopaedias break up the knowledge they choose and order it in a specific way. In *Ordnungen des Wissens*, Paul Michel explains that the organization of knowledge happens in two steps: in the first step, which Michel calls 'Lemmatisieren' ('lemmatising'), the chosen knowledge needs to be broken up into smaller, more manageable pieces. In the second step, these pieces of knowledge have to be arranged in a specific way. Michel calls this 'Disponieren' ('disposing').[82] In an open list he describes twenty kinds of dispositions he had come across in ancient, medieval and modern encyclopaedias. He emphasises that the list is not complete and that

[78] Ibid. p. vi.
[79] Gluck, 'The Fine Folly', p. 42.
[80] Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 11.
[81] Gluck, 'The Fine Folly', p. 42.
[82] Paul Michel, 'Ordnungen des Wissens', p. 35. – On the topic of encyclopaedias and their ordering of knowledge see also: Stammen and Weber (eds.), *Wissenssicherung*.

new types of dispositions are found again and again.[83] What is more, the different dispositions are often not pure and overlap with other dispositions.[84] Michel's list shows how multifarious the dispositions are: they range from dispositions drawing from the bible to some based on the calendar, travelogues or the alphabet. Alphabetical disposition most commonly found in modern encyclopaedias such as the *AE* is not self-evident. The way in which an encyclopaedia is lemmatised is crucial since this contributes significantly to the encyclopaedia's political power: it has been argued that the way we categorise our world affects our perception.[85]

1.2 Encyclopaedias from a Political Perspective

The claim that encyclopaedias possess political potential derives from a cultural historical approach to politics. Cultural history looks at political history through a different lens from both traditional political history, focussed on the actions of states and statesmen, and new social history, which has concentrated on structures and political associations. Cultural history by definition is more concerned with the representations, symbols and rituals that accompany political acts which are at the same time part of the these acts.[86] Thomas Mergel argues convincingly that representations, symbols and rituals are at least as important for politics as the actual political acts – such as the creation of new laws – using an example from German history:

> *Ein Gesetz ist zunächst nur ein Text, und es ist ein weiter Weg bis dahin, dass es zu einer anerkannten und durchgesetzten Norm wird. Hier sind es oft die symbolischen Akte, die den Weg ebnen. Was war wichtiger für die Durchsetzung der Neuen Ostpolitik anfangs der 70er Jahre, die Verabschiedung der Ostverträge oder der Kniefall Willy Brandts in Warschau?*
>
> *(A law is initially only words, and it is a long process until it becomes an accepted and enforced norm. It is often the symbolic acts that pave the way here. What was more important for the enforcement of the new Eastern policy at the beginning of the 70's, the adoption of the Eastern treaties or the prostration of Willy Brandt in Warsaw?)*[87]

Representations, symbols and rituals are not just accessory parts of politics, but are vital aspects of it that in turn create new political realities. This explains and justifies the

[83] Michel, 'Ordnungen des Wissens', p. 75.
[84] Ibid. p. 74.
[85] Ibid. p. 76.
[86] See: Thomas Mergel, 'Überlegungen zu einer Kulturgeschichte der Politik', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28 (4), 2002, pp. 576–595.
[87] Mergel, 'Überlegungen', p. 602. Transl. into Engl. by N.K.

perspective cultural history takes on political realities and on the world: they are interpreted as communicative constructions.[88]

For the cultural historian, encyclopaedias are representations that create political realities. I will argue that the *AE* was not just a cultural artefact but a significant political factor in the building of the Australian nation. In the absence of a unique history, Australian nationalists resorted to other means to create a feeling of national belonging: traditions had to be invented. Eric Hobsbawm, who together with Terence Ranger introduced the term 'invented tradition', defines it in the introduction to *The Invention of Tradition* as follows:

> *'Invented Tradition' is taken to mean a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. In fact, where possible, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a suitable historic past.*[89]

Hobsbawm observes that inventing traditions is highly relevant to the creation of nations.[90]

But who are the inventors of the traditions that generate national feeling? As a matter of course, innumerable people and institutions contribute. Literature and art typically play key roles. In the case of Australia, the *Sydney Bulletin* used its writers and illustrators to promote a national tradition that excluded indigenous and other non-European Australians. The creators of the *AE* also intended to promote the formation of an exclusive Australian nation by strengthening a feeling of belonging among its readers. The evidence indicates that they were remarkably successful.

The strength of a nation once established does not consist merely in its military and economic power, but also in what has been described as its 'soft power'. The concept 'soft power' was first defined and later developed by Joseph Nye in his books *Bound to Lead* and *Soft Power*.[91] According to Nye, soft power is 'the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments. It arises from the attractiveness of a

---

[88] Ibid. p. 590.
[89] Eric Hobsbawm, 'Introduction: Inventing Traditions', *The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds.) (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1983) p. 1.
[90] Hobsbawm, 'Introduction', p. 13.
[91] Joseph Nye, *Bound to Lead: the Changing Nature of American Power* (Basic Books, New York 1990). – Joseph Nye, *Soft Power: the Means to Success in World Politics* (Public Affairs, New York 2004).

country's culture, political ideals, and policies.'[92] Nye uses this concept of soft power to describe relations between different nations: soft power in his sense is the power of one nation over another (or several others). The concept is also applicable to power relations within nations. Successful government requires more than military and economic power. The actions and ideas of political leaders, if the politicians are to remain in control, must be attractive. For a newly founded nation, soft power is even more important. Its leaders, lacking a long established political system to justify their position, must rely completely on the attractiveness of the nation and its institutions to its people. Propaganda is vital for the development of any new nation. In this context the *Australian Encyclopaedia* can be described as contributing to the soft power of the new Australian nation.

Britain as the metropolis of a great empire had soft power at its disposal in the nineteenth century. Many people in the Australian colonies still felt British, were attracted to British culture, political ideals and policies and relied on British general knowledge. Britain was still thought of as and called 'home' by numerous Australians.[93] How strong was this British influence in the 1920s? The Australian colonies had been self-governing since the 1850s and had officially founded their own nation through Federation more than twenty years before. But an important aspect of colonialism must not be neglected: what has often been called 'colonisation of the mind'. John McLeod, explaining postcolonial theory, writes:

> *freedom from colonialism comes not just from the signing of declarations of independence and the lowering and raising of flags. There must also be a change in the minds, a challenge to the dominant ways of seeing.*[94]

Or in Karl Schlögel's words: 'Imperien leben in den Köpfen fort, auch wenn sie längst zusammengebrochen sind.' ('Empires continue to live in people's minds, even if they collapsed a long time ago.')[95] How much had Australian minds already been decolonised by 1925? Encyclopaedias are a good starting point to explore this question, because an analysis of encyclopaedias – a comparison of the *AE* with *Chambers*, its acknowledged model – will provide data on the degree to which the encyclopaedia makers still relied on British knowledge and sources.

---

[92] Nye, *Soft Power*, p. x.
[93] Even in the 1950s there were still Australians calling Britain 'home'. (See: Raymond Evans et al., *1901, Our Future's Past: Documenting Australia's Federation* (Pan Macmillan Australia, Sydney 1997) p. 185.)
[94] John McLeod, *Beginning Postcolonialism* (Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York 2000) p. 22.
[95] Karl Schlögel, *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit.: Über Zivilisationsgeschichte und Geopolitik* (Hanser, München and Wien 2003) p. 245. Transl. into Engl. by N.K.

Historians have established that imperialism has an impact not only on the colonial societies involved, but also on the society of the metropolitan power.[96] Postcolonial theory deals with the experiences of people in colonised – or formerly colonised – countries and examines the interweaving of the histories of the colonisers and the colonised. It rejects the view that European countries developed independently, separate from the rest of the world, and that Europe had changed the world radically without being affected itself.[97] Britain as the centre clearly had power over the periphery, Australia, but the reverse is also true: the newly founded Australian nation influenced Britain. The exchange of ideas went both ways. Therefore it is important to investigate to which degree the general knowledge produced in the *AE* was taken up in *Chambers* and thereby made into British general knowledge.

A postcolonial approach also implies a transnational (and often transcultural) approach. Transnational history can be defined as 'the study of the ways in which past lives and events have been shaped by processes and relationships that have transcended the borders of nation states'.[98] Historians working with a transnational approach have recognised that nation-centred historiography, despite the admitted political importance of the nation-state, is limited in its capacity to provide historical explanations. A national view on historical events, movements and ideas is just one among many other possible perspectives that are most often interdependent. Ian Tyrrell, one of the first historians to explicitly point out the importance of a transnational perspective, wrote in his influential study 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History':

> *History is not a set of data to be deposited into tidy boxes, of which that national box is the most obvious and sensible. History is, much more than most historians are willing to accept, a constructed body of knowledge.*[99]

The study of nation building is not exempt from the need to widen national approaches by introducing a transnational perspective. Tyrrell has pointed out that 'the very concept of nationalism as a motivating ideology implies both localism and internationalism as its

[96] See: Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake, 'Introduction', *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*, Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds.) (ANU E Press, Canberra 2005) p. 9.
[97] Sebastian Conrad and Shalini Randeria, 'Einleitung: Geteilte Geschichten – Europa in einer postkolonialen Welt', *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus: Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*, Sebastian Conrad and Shalini Randeria (eds.) (Campus-Verlag, Frankfurt and New York 2002) pp. 10 and 25.
[98] Curthoys and Lake, 'Introduction', p. 5.
[99] Ian Tyrrell, 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History', *The American Historical Review*, 96 (4), 1991, p. 1033.

points of contrast.'[100] Chapter three will show that the nation building project of the *AE* also relied on British values and general knowledge.

Modern history should thus be understood as an ensemble of interconnections, as sociologist Shalini Randeria and historian Sebastian Conrad write.[101] Randeria and Conrad introduced into historiography Randeria's concept of 'geteilte Geschichten' ('shared histories') or 'entangled histories'. This concept stresses the fact that colonisers and colonised societies are interconnected, 'transfers', implying cultural translations, going both ways.[102] The concept of 'entangled history' shows that the division of empire into centre and periphery is too simple. Tony Ballantyne's metaphor of a web – 'a metaphor that forces us to keep in mind the constant traffic between and interconstitution of multiple imperial sites' –[103] is much more appropriate.[104]

A transnational or entanglement approach to knowledge production in Australia and Britain can only be assumed if one accepts that Australia in the 1920s was already a distinct nation. Australia had officially become a nation with Federation already in 1901, even if the nation was not fully accomplished in the minds of the Australian people. The usage of the terms 'transnational' and 'entangled history' in this study are thus based on the formal foundation of the Australian nation.

Within the entanglement approach the concept of soft power needs to be slightly adapted: the fact that (for example) knowledge is transferred from one society to another does not automatically mean that the first country is active, exerting soft power over the second, being passive. Transferred knowledge is often appropriated by the recipient

[100] Tyrrell, 'American Exceptionalism', p. 1050.
[101] Conrad and Randeria, 'Einleitung', p. 17. – See also: Hartmut Kaelble, 'Die Debatte über Vergleich und Transfer und was jetzt?' *geschichte.transnational*. (URL: geschichte-transnational.clio-online.net/forum/id=574&type=artikel, paragraph 6, accessed 21 December 04.)
[102] Kaelble, 'Vergleich und Transfer', paragraph 6. – See also: Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, 'Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung: Der Ansatz der *Histoire croisée* und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28 (4), 2002, p. 614. Werner and Zimmermann emphasise that the categories used in analyses with a transnational approach, such as the concept of 'entangled history', have to be questioned and constantly modified because they are constructions that contribute to the entanglement. (Werner and Zimmermann, 'Vergleich', pp. 607–636.)
[103] Angela Woollacott, 'Postcolonial Histories and Catherine Hall's *Civilising Subjects*', *Connected Worlds*, Curthoys and Lake (eds.), p. 67.
[104] Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empir*e (Palgrave, Basingstoke and New York 2002) pp. 14–15.

country.[105] Hartmut Kaelble observes that so far, transfers from colonies to mother countries have been researched very rarely and that in general, there are very few empirical studies examining 'entangled histories'.[106] The comparison of the *AE* with *Chambers* will supply data to this debate.

Postcolonial theorists also stress that the lines between colonisers and colonised can not be drawn in distinct ways.[107] This is especially true for Australia. Unlike in what Jürgen Osterhammel calls 'Beherrschungskolonien' ('colonies of containment')[108], like for example India, in Australia there was not a big mass of indigenous people and a relatively small group of British colonisers. Australia was a settler colony of the new-English type. This means that a big population of settlers displaced and dispossessed the indigenous population.[109] As a consequence, colonialism, defined by Osterhammel as a relationship of dominance ('Herrschaftsverhältnis'),[110] was three-fold in Australia. The settlers thought themselves to be superior to the indigenous peoples. But at the same time, as colonial people, they themselves were considered to be – and often felt – inferior to the British. The contact between the colonisers and the colonised in Australia was of a different nature than the one between the British and the indigenous population in India. Nonetheless, the relationship between the British and the indigenous population in Australia and between the British and the white colonials was one of dominance. Therefore, Osterhammel is mistaken when he uses Australia as an example for '*Kolonien ohne Kolonialismus*' (colonies without colonialism).[111] In the Australian context it is particularly difficult to draw the lines between colonisers and colonised. For example, would a convict who had been transported to Australia be considered a coloniser or a colonised? And when did a British immigrant become an Australian colonial?[112] An example to illustrate this difficulty to distinguish different groups is the case of Arthur Wilberforce Jose. Jose was born and educated in Britain and came to Australia in 1882,

[105] See: Matthias Middell, 'Transnationale Geschichte als transnationales Projekt? Zur Einführung in die Diskussion', *geschichte.transnational*. (URL: geschichte-transnational.clio-online.net/forum/id=57&type=artikel, paragraph 3, accessed 17 December 04.)
[106] Kaelble, 'Vergleich und Transfer', paragraphs 6 and 13.
[107] Conrad and Shalini, *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus*, p. 25.
[108] Jürgen Osterhammel, *Kolonialismus: Geschichte – Formen – Folgen*, 4th edn. (Beck, München 2003) p. 17.
[109] Osterhammel, *Kolonialismus*, p. 12. – See also Patrick Wolfe who criticises postcolonial theory, claiming it does not adequately distinct between these different types of colonies. Patrick Wolfe, 'History and Imperialism: A Century of Theory, from Marx to Postcolonialism', *The American Historical Review*, 102 (2), 1997, p. 418.
[110] Osterhammel, *Kolonialismus*, p. 8.
[111] Ibid. pp. 21–22.
[112] See also: Robert Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* (Blackwell, Oxford 2001) p. 19.

when he was nineteen years old.[113] Correspondence between Jose and Angus & Robertson as well as the editors of *Chambers* in Edinburgh reveals that Jose felt British and Australian at the same time.[114] Australian nationalism and loyalty to the British empire were often intertwined.

The Australian nation building process is paradoxically not a movement separate from Britain. It can only be fully understood by considering its development in Australia as well as the exchange of knowledge and values between Australia and Britain it involves. Both can be achieved by combining a transnational with a chronological analysis of encyclopaedias. Comparing the *AE* with *Chambers* and Heaton's *Dictionary* will not only reveal how nation building changed its character between 1879 and 1925, but also to what extent the construction of the Australian nation influenced and was influenced by British general knowledge.

[113] Teresa Pagliaro, *Arthur Wilberforce Jose (1863–1934): An Anglo-Australian* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sydney 1990) pp. 30 and 33.
[114] See chapter 3.

2 Australia and the Core of Nation Building

2.1 Theoretical Approaches to Nation Building

Many distinct and conflicting theories on the origin of nationalism and nations were developed in the twentieth century. No consensus on the matter has yet been found. Part of the problem, as Paul Lawrence remarks, is the 'multifaceted character of both nations and nationalism'.[115] Anthony D. Smith distinguishes three different paradigms on the origin of nations and nationalism, in addition to his own ethno-symbolic approach: modernism, perennialism and primordialism.[116] All four theories have been subject to analysis and criticism. Primordialism, the view that nations are natural phenomena, and perennialism, 'the view that, even if nationalist ideology was recent, nations had always existed in every period of history, and that many nations existed from time immemorial', are considered by contemporary historians to be inadequate.[117] Modernism and ethno-symbolism are still seen as viable alternative theories. The term modernism embraces a range of approaches; however all modernists agree on the basic premise that nationalism is a modern phenomenon and most argue that nationalism precedes the nation.[118] Ethno-symbolists on the other hand claim that 'modern nations had evolved from or coalesced around pre-modern *ethnie*.'[119] This conflict between modernists and ethno-symbolists has never been resolved. However, the two theories are not mutually exclusive. It is possible to argue that nations are a modern phenomenon, but that they can be traced back to ethnic communities predating modernity.

Post-modernist approaches developed in the 1990s aimed at deconstructing established conceptions of nation and nationality.[120] These theories take the credit of having pointed out the fractured, multiple character of national identity.[121] National identity is not monolithic but consists of many different aspects which may not be consistent with each other. The multiple character of national identity is especially evident in the Australian case.

---

[115] Paul Lawrence, *Nationalism: History and Theory* (Pearson Education, Harlow and New York 2005) p. 1.
[116] Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History* (Polity Press, Malden (Mass.) 2001) pp. 43–61.
[117] Smith, *Nationalism*, p. 49.
[118] Lawrence, *Nationalism*, p. 163.
[119] Ibid. p. 181.
[120] Ibid. p. 198.
[121] Ibid. p. 205.

Benedict Anderson's work *Imagined Communities* is both modernist and postmodernist. His claim that nations only emerged at the end of the eighteenth century, replacing earlier kinds of communities provided by dynasties and religion, is clearly modernist.[122] But Anderson allows for the postmodern findings, calling attention to the constructed character of nations, when he defines the nation as 'an imagined political community'[123]. Even if one does not agree with Anderson's modernist position one can still accept his definition of the nation. The ethno-symbolic claim that many nations can be traced back to *ethnie* does not contradict Anderson's definition. Even if a nation does have subjective roots it has to be aware of itself as a community, to imagine itself as a community, to qualify as a nation.

2.2 Definitions

In the following discussion I will use Anderson's definition of the term 'nation', with some modification. Anderson adds to his definition that the nation is 'imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign'.[124] There is no doubt that nations have to be imagined as limited, because only through the imagination of other nations beyond certain boundaries can people see their own nation as something distinct.[125] But I would like to contest the argument that nations are always imagined as sovereign. Even though Scottish nation building started at the end of the eighteenth century, there was no significant movement within Scotland to become sovereign until the 1920s, or to a more serious degree until the 1960s.[126]

So how does the term 'nation' relate to 'nationalism'? Anthony Smith specifies five meanings of the term 'nationalism' today:

> *(1) a process of formation, or growth, of nations;*
>
> *(2) a sentiment or consciousness of belonging to the nation;*
>
> *(3) a language and symbolism of the nation;*
>
> *(4) a social and political movement on behalf of the nation;*
>
> *(5) a doctrine and/or ideology of the nation, both general and particular.*[127]

[122] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, pp. 9–36.
[123] Ibid. p. 6.
[124] Ibid.
[125] Ibid. p. 7.
[126] Neil Davidson, *The Origins of Scottish Nationhood* (Pluto Press, London 2000) p. 200.
[127] Smith, *Nationalism*, pp. 5–6.

Definitions two and four of Smith's list (with slight modifications) will be useful in the context of this thesis. 'Nationalism' is here used to describe either the sentiment or consciousness of belonging to an imagined political community, or social, cultural or political attempts to create an imagined political community. In Australia's case 'nationalism' is referring to a political community contiguous with the whole continent.

How much 'nationalism' is needed for a community to reach the status of a nation? How many people have to imagine the political community for it to become a nation? Is it sufficient to have a small circle of politicians, writers or artists (or a combination of them) to imagine the nation? Anderson does not explicitly address this issue but his comments following his definition leave no doubt that a nation in his sense is only achieved if the majority of people belonging to it imagine it.[128]

2.3 Measuring Nation Building?

There is some dissension about when nationalism first emerged in Australia and about when Australia became a nation.[129] In his study from 1989, Noel McLachlan ascribes the roots of Australian nationalism to the arrival of the British in Australia and sees nationalist feelings already in the lead up to the Eureka rebellion. But he leaves his readers in uncertainty about what these nationalist sentiments entailed. He calls them 'European nationalist sentiment (…) projected (…) onto the Australian landscape', but leaves open whether he means nationalism directed towards the British Empire, or rather the Australian colonies, or even only the colony of Victoria.[130] McLachlan is the only contemporary historian who dates the emergence of Australian nationalism so early.[131] Richard White indicates that during most of the nineteenth century, 'Australians saw themselves, and were seen by others as part of a group of new, transplanted, predominantly Anglo-Saxon emigrant societies'.[132] Stephen Alomes, whose *A Nation at Last?* – a work that is still very influential today – was published in 1988, asserts that 'political and cultural nationalism did not become important in Australian colonial life

[128] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, pp. 6–7.
[129] See: Neville Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity: the Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 2001, p. 76.
[130] Noel McLachlan, *Waiting for the Revolution: A History of Australian Nationalism* (Penguin, Ringwood (VIC) 1989) p. 97.
[131] By linking the first stirrings of nationalism with William Charles Wentworth, Denis McLean also dates the emergence of Australian nationalism earlier than other historians, but he does not trace it back to the arrival of the British. (Denis McLean, *The Prickly Pair: Making Nationalism in Australia and New Zealand* (University of Otago Press, Dunedin 2003) pp. 47–50.)
[132] Richard White, *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688–1980* (George Allen & Unwin, Sydney 1981) p. 47.

until the 1880s'.[133] Some historians like John Manning Ward hold that even in the 1890s, few people in Australia 'saw Australia as a nation, then or in the future'.[134]

There are several reasons for this obscurity about the emergence of Australian nationalism. Historians doing research on Australian nation building have not worked with congruent definitions of the terms 'nation' and 'nationalism'. Many historians, including McLachlan, fail to define 'nation' and 'nationalism' and remain vague about exactly what they mean when they use these terms. It must be conceded that the nation building process is difficult to measure, particularly in the Australian case where an independence movement or liberation struggle is lacking.[135] Australian nation building was, as Lyn Spillman puts it,

> *the result of a slow process of cultural innovation and diffusion, a process that looks unfocused, uncertain, and subtle – if it is even visible – when set alongside the more familiar and typical story of the creation of nationalities.*[136]

How can the beginning of such a slow and subtle process be pinpointed? How do we know when the point of nationhood was reached? The nature of nation building means that we will never be able to identify an exact point in time for the emergence of nationalism. But questioning the choice of primary sources we base our analysis of nation building on will bring us a great deal closer to a conclusion. Since nationalism is a phenomenon affecting society as a whole and not just separate aspects of it, such as politics, the primary sources we use, when combined, must encompass the society as a whole too. Ideally research on nationalism should thus be based on a wide and disparate range of sources. Such an approach is beyond the scope of a single monograph and requires collaboration between a large number of historians over an extended period of time. However, there are some sources that offer a unique perspective on nation building which to date have been largely neglected in the context of Australian nation building.[137] National encyclopaedias such as the *AE* are not only constructed to represent a society as

---

[133] Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, p. 13.
[134] Ward, *The State and the* People, p. 52.
[135] See also: Stephen Castles et al., *Mistaken Identity, Multiculturalism, and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*, 3rd edn. (Pluto Press, Sydney 1992) p. 7.
[136] Lyn Spillman, *Nation and Commemoration: Creating National Identities in the United States and Australia* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York 1997) p. 19.
[137] Encyclopaedias are not even referred to in bibliographies or references in the most recent studies of federation and Australian nation building. The only exception is Birrell who refers to the *AE* in a footnote, but sees it only as a 'commentator' on the political processes of the time. (See: Robert Birrell, *Federation: the Secret Story* (Duffy & Snellgrove, Sydney 2001) p. 196.) See also: John Hirst, *The Sentimental Nation: The Making of the Australian Commonwealth* (Oxford University Press, South Melbourne 2000). – McLean, *The Prickly Pair*. – Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*. – Spillman, *Nation and Commemoration.*

a whole, but also have the power to influence the society they are situated in. With these functions encyclopaedias reach the core of the nation building process. The following overview of the factors and forces that played a role in the early Australian nation building process will make clear what this core is and why encyclopaedias have a special significance for the concept of nation building.

2.4 Factors and Forces in the Australian Nation Building Process

During the nineteenth century and in the first half of the twentieth century most people in Australia identified just as much (if not more) with communities below or above the level of an Australian nation. Identification with the British Empire as well as with individual colonies still loomed large in the minds of the Australian people. Between 1900 and 1913 every state apart from Queensland published their own state encyclopaedia.[138]

Neville Meaney maintains that it was not possible for an Australian and a British national myth to coexist at the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century. He writes that 'national myths are absolute in their exclusions as well as their inclusions' and that 'it is only in the post-nationalist Western era that dual nationality has come to be tolerated.' Meaney holds that if there *had* been two national myths in Australia then there would have been a civil war.[139] Although Meaney is right in his assertion that nationalism is exclusive – it excludes certain people – nationalism does not prevent people from belonging to other nations at the same time. One can always imagine and belong to several communities. Britain and Scotland deliver a telling parallel: British and Scottish national identity developed at the same time and a person could feel both British *and* Scottish.[140] Meaney's interpretation of the concept of the nation signifies a reversion to a radical-nationalist perspective – the assumption of a given Australian national character

[138] *The Cyclopedia of Tasmania: an Historical and Commercial Review. Descriptive and Biographical Facts, Figures and Illustrations. An Epitome of Progress. Business Men and Commerical Interests* (Maitland and Krone, Hobart 1899–1900). – James Smith (ed.), *The Cyclopedia of Victoria: an Historical and Commercial Review. Descriptive and Biographical Facts, Figures and Illustrations. An Epitome of Progress* (The Cyclopedia Company, Melbourne 1903–1905). – *The Cyclopedia of New South Wales (illustrated): an Historical and Commercial Review. Descriptive and Biographical Facts, Figures and Illustrations. An Epitome of Progress* (The Cyclopedia Company, Sydney 1904). – H.T. Burgess (ed.), *The Cyclopedia of South Australia* (The Cyclopedia Company, Adelaide 1907). – J.S. Battye (ed.), *The Cyclopedia of Western Australia: an Historical and Commercial Review. Descriptive and Biographical Facts, Figures and Illustrations. An Epitome of Progress* (Hussey & Gillingham for the Cyclopedia Company, Adelaide 1912–1913).
[139] Meaney, 'Britishness', p. 78.
[140] See: Davidson, *Scottish Nationhood*.

whose history can be pinpointed by the historian. However since the 1980s it has generally been recognised that there is nothing like a singular national identity.[141]

At the turn of the twentieth century one could consider oneself to be a New South Welshman, an Australian and British at the same time. State, national and imperial sources of identity competed with each other far into the twentieth century. The degree to which Australians felt Australian or British changed through time but also varied from individual to individual. Lyn Spillman maintains that

> *sometimes the importance of Britishness in Australian national identity was understood in terms of filial loyalty. Sometimes this filial loyalty extended to the proud vision of Australia becoming another Britain. Sometimes it was understood as membership in worldwide empire.*[142]

That some people in Australia hoped that Australia would become another Britain reveals an important characteristic of Australian society at the turn of the twentieth century: the general perception of the British 'race' as superior. This notion was also connected with an ingrained anxiety: what would happen to the British stock under the hot Australian sun? Would the climate have a degrading effect on the British race? Did the convict origin imply that the British in Australia were inferior to the British in the motherland?[143] Most people were relieved to see the production of colonial heroes in sport, culture and at war, who seemed to prove that Australians were not inferior to the British.[144]

This constant comparison with the British and the general orientation towards Britain were still prevalent in the 1920s when the *AE* was published. The Australian 1920s were an ambiguous time. On the one hand, the self-image of the 1920s was one of growth and renewal. Motorcars were seen more and more numerously in Australian streets, the radio and the cinema became popular, and electricity grids brought novel household gadgets such as the electric kettle, the iron and the vacuum cleaner. On the other hand, many workers could not afford these new forms of consumption. After the war, when the soldiers returned to Australia, jobs were scarce and even though the labour market improved in the first years of the 1920s, finding a job could prove difficult. Fewer unskilled workers were needed because of increased mechanisation. As a result, the 1920s

[141] See for example: Geoffrey Stokes (ed.), *The Politics of Identity in Australia* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and Melbourne 1997) pp. 2 and 4.
[142] Spillman, *Nation and Commemoration*, p. 65.
[143] See for example: Hirst, *The Sentimental Nation*, p. 33. And: W.F. Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 59 (4), 1973, p. 233.
[144] White, *Inventing Australia*, pp. 71–72.

saw a very high unemployment rate (ranging from 6.5% to 11.2%)[145] and conflicts between capital and labour.[146]

Nevertheless Australia was depicted by Australian politicians as a land with unlimited possibilities for growth and as a rural extension of Britain. The term 'Australia Unlimited' was omnipresent, describing the belief that with the investment of capital and labour, the country would blossom. This policy was heavily reliant on Britain: British immigrants, British investors and British customers.[147] Immigration and naturalisation policy in the 1920s became more strict, including entry quotas for southern Europeans and other immigrants who were considered to be undesirable.[148] The orientation towards Britain manifested itself in politics and the economy as well as in many other areas. Australian middle-class and upper-middle class culture showed a clear orientation towards Britain. The loyalties of the Australian people were ambiguous, including Britishness *and* Australianness.[149] From the perspective of someone who wanted to promote the Australian nation, a work like the *AE* must have seemed necessary in this environment. The *AE* was a conscious attempt to further the building of an Australian national community. Such attempts had been made on a political as well as a cultural level at latest since the 1880s. Some of these were more successful than others, and there were also factors contributing to the emergence of an embryonic Australian nation that were only turned into instruments of nation building with hindsight.

2.4.1 Federation

> *Federation represented less the birth of a nation and the culmination of patriotic feeling, than a readjustment of colonial relations, a somewhat shabby deal among the colonies based on deep suspicions and self interested manoeuvring.*[150]

Or:

> *It is my hypothesis that the nationalist movement was the crucial factor in bringing it [federation, N.K.] to fruition.*[151]
>
> *The 1900s were a great era of reform, at the state and voluntary levels as well as in the federal arena. Middle-class activists in social welfare, health and*

[145] Alomes, *Australian Nationalism*, p. 182.
[146] Stuart Macintyre, *A Concise History of Australia*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2004) pp. 171–172. See also: Alomes, *Australian Nationalism*, p. 193.
[147] See: Macintyre, *A Concise History*, p. 170.
[148] Ibid. pp. 174–175.
[149] See: Alomes, *Australian Nationalism*, p. 184.
[150] White, *Inventing Australia*, p. 111.
[151] Birrell, *Federation*, p. 12.

> *education worked to extend the rights of citizens in their respective fields. In all these reform efforts we find leaders justifying their actions in terms of the greater good of the community or nation.*[152]

These are the two extremes between which the interpretations of federation by today's historians range: Federation portrayed as 'a shabby deal' or in complete contrast as an enterprise driven by nationalist sentiment and by the will to reform. The first quote was penned by Richard White (*Inventing Australia*), the second and third by Bob Birrell (*Federation*).

In the introduction to his work *Federation*, Birrell claims that supporters of a negative account of federation are politically motivated. By arguing that federation did not produce a unique Australian society and that Australia remained British dominated, members of the multicultural movement – according to Birrell – could support their demand that everyone in present-day Australia, including people from Anglo-Saxon origin, should be regarded as ethnics.[153] On the other hand Birrell admits that his own account of the federation era is partial,[154] and he even displays his political motives rather proudly:

> *Negative views about Australia's past now percolate deep into the media, and the school and university curricula. The effects can be seen in the preconceptions students bring to their university studies. (...) We appear to have raised a generation which has no sense that it can draw anything of value or inspiration from our past. (...) But nations which do not have a strong sense of confidence in their own identity and traditions are vulnerable to the imposition of foreign interests. A nation with no pride in its heritage or even any shared historical memory of valued achievement is a nation vulnerable to serious internal divisions.*[155]

In other words, Birrell wants to provide young people with a positive account of the federation era so they can be proud of their nation and keep foreign influences off. Not surprisingly, the bulk of recent historical writings keeps much closer to White's interpretation of federation than Birrell's.

The following is a synopsis of the various themes that in recent historiography have been mentioned as momentums in the Australian federation movement. The basis

[152] Ibid. p. 21.
[153] Ibid. p. 6.
[154] Ibid. p. 7.
[155] Ibid. pp. 9–10.

for this synopsis is one of the most recent historical accounts on federation, Roslyn Russell's and Philip Chubb's *One Destiny*.[156]

Defence

Many writers dealing with federation – for example Russell and Chubb, Alison Broinowski, Lyn Spillman and John Ward – either imply or state that national defence was an important driving force in the federation movement.[157] Stephen Alomes even holds that it was 'the strongest factor behind federation'.[158] Robert Birrell's argument that there was no outside threat to the Australian colonies that would have had the effect to bring the colonies together in their defence disregards the views of numerous Australians before the turn to the twentieth century.[159] In the eyes of many Australians at the time there was a definite threat: in the 1880s, Australian colonists in the Pacific were becoming more and more afraid of German as well as French plans for the area. German companies had developed colonisation plans, and in 1876, the French had suggested to the British government to allow convicts who been released from prison in New Caledonia to settle in the Australian colonies. There were even reports claiming that the French intended to bring habitual criminals to New Caledonia. This swayed Queensland's premier Sir Thomas McIlwraith to demand British annexation of the unclaimed part of Papua New Guinea. A magistrate from Thursday Island was sent to do the job immediately.[160]

But the British government did not endorse the annexation. In a memorandum McIlwraith therefore suggested that the colonies take united action and he even proposed a convention to discuss a union of the colonies. McIlwraith's recommendations were the prelude to efforts by several state leaders, especially by Victoria's premier James Service, that finally led to the foundation of the Federal Council of Australasia. From the 28th of November to the 5th of December 1883 a meeting had taken place in Sydney between representatives of all the parliaments of the Australian colonies, including New Zealand and Fiji. At this convention, various issues were discussed, including the problem in the Pacific. The results of the meeting were resolutions on the Papua New Guinea issue as

[156] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*.
[157] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, pp. 65–86. – Alison Broinowski, 'The Japanese in the Big Picture', *Makers of Miracles: The Cast of the Federation Story*, David Headon and John Williams (eds.) (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 2000) p. 201. – Spillman, *Nation and Commemoration*, p. 30. – Ward, *The State and the People*, p. 52.
[158] Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, p. 19.
[159] Birrell, *Federation*, p. 12.
[160] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, p. 70.

well as a bill to establish a Federal Council of Australasia. Among others, the council was to have legislative jurisdiction over the relationship between Australasia and the islands of the Pacific and prevent criminals from entering Australian territory. The bill was never accepted in New South Wales and soon regarded as a 'Victorian invention'.[161]

In the meantime, the Australian colonies continued to urge the British Government to annex New Guinea and finally succeeded in October 1884. The British Parliament considered the terms of the Federal Council of Australasia Bill and passed it in August 1885. The legislation was adopted by the legislatures of Western Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria and Fiji. Even though New South Wales never joined the council, South Australia only attended one meeting and most commentators at the time considered the council to be ineffective, it can be considered as a step towards federation.[162] The fact that the Australian colonies had feared German and French movements in the north of Australia had led the colonies to work together, to move closer to the idea of an Australian federation.

Trade

Russell and Chubb concur with other historians like Stephen Alomes and John Manning Ward that trade was an important issue in the lead up to Federation.[163] Before Federation every colony had its own railway system with its own gauge which caused considerable difficulties at the borders for trade. The colonies also applied different economical policies in the last decades of the nineteenth century: in New South Wales free trade was practised, whereas Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania were mainly protectionist. These issues caused troubles for federationists who wanted to make federation popular with their colonial legislatures and with the public. But on the other hand, traders 'saw advantages in one market free of colonial customs and tariff barriers.'[164] The people living in the border regions suffered greatly from these trade complications. The removal of customs duties between the colonies stood high on the agenda of those who fought for federation.

[161] Ibid. pp. 74–79.
[162] Ibid. pp. 74–86.
[163] Ibid. p. 29. – Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, p. 19. – Ward, *The State and the People*, p. 52.
[164] Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, p. 19.

Attitudes towards the Chinese and other Non-Europeans

Another issue that furthered collaboration between the Australian colonies were attitudes towards the Chinese and other non-European immigrants that eventually led to the 'White Australia' policy.[165] Hostile feelings against the Chinese dated back to the 1850s, when large numbers of Chinese men arrived on the southern Australian goldfields. Initially, they had come to Australia under contracts to agents in China to replace the laborers who had left their work to go to the goldfields. But soon many Chinese tried their own luck on the goldfields, often very successfully, which soon caused resentment. In 1861 this resentment erupted into violence on the Chinese in the settlements at Lambing Flat: 'a mob of more than three thousand diggers descended on the Chinese settlements at Lambing Flat and beat the Chinese, cut off their pigtails, stole their gold and set fire to their property.'[166] The reasons that underlay this animosity towards the Chinese (as well as towards other non-Europeans) and that finally led to 'White Australia' were complex. Above all, there was the notion that the white race was superior to other races and that it had to be protected from foreign influences.[167] The Chinese were often portrayed as immoral, as transmitters of disease and as a threat to Australian workers. They were made into scapegoats for various social problems.[168]

It was the actions of the Australian Steam and Navigation Company (ASN) that was the last straw that broke the camel's back: in 1878 the ASN replaced one hundred European crewmen with Chinese men who were to work for half wages. When later in the year the company repeated this procedure, the Seamen's Union went on strike. In 1882 the ASN disposed of all Chinese workers . The Australian public would no longer tolerate cheap Chinese labour, and there was increased agitation by unionists and tradesmen against Chinese labour. Finally the colonial governments saw themselves forced to deal with these problems: an Australasian intercolonial conference was organised for December 1880 to January 1881. As a result of the conference, the so-called *Chinese Act*

[165] For the 'White Australia' policy see for example: Jürgen Matthäus, '"Für alle Zeiten weiss": Einwanderungspolitik und nationales Selbstverständnis Australiens im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 50 (4), 2003, pp. 294–315.
[166] Timothy Kendall, *Ways of Seeing China: From Yellow Peril to Shangrila* (Curtin University Books, Fremantle 2005) p. 22.
[167] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, pp. 98–99.
[168] Ibid. p. 88.

was passed, legislation ruling that every Chinese who entered Australia had to pay a £10 entry tax.[169]

Economical concerns with cheap Chinese labour had forced the colonies to work together since the Australian colonies could not resort to Britain with their problems. Britain disapproved of the *Chinese Act* and would not allow legislation that breached its treaty with China.[170] The intercolonial conference of 1880 and 1881 had built the prelude to the introduction of a joint 'White Australia' policy which constituted an important force in the formal building of the Australian nation.

Birrell's argument that 'White Australia' was primarily a social program – in the sense of 'creating a community in which all members were accorded a respected status' – and only had a 'racist element' is unsustainable.[171] 'White Australia' did not have an *element* of racism: its whole origin and base was unmistakably racist. To say that all members of the community were given 'a respected status' does not prove much. If one excludes so many people – indigenous groups and many non-Europeans – from the community – it is not such an achievement to accord all the remaining members the same 'respected status'. Raymond Evans et al. are right to point out that even within the community of people who were given citizen status the wealthier members had more social and legal power on a practical level.[172] Birrell's view of the federation movement as a nationalist struggle for civil rights and his interpretation of 'White Australia' ('White Australia can be read as a national doctrine expressing a value system which was the antithesis of the hierarchical values predominating in Britain (or Asia) at the time'[173]) is not sustainable.[174]

Nationalism vs. Political Careers

Bob Birrell turns against revisionist writers by asserting that federation was essentially a nationalist movement driven by an emotional commitment to form a new Australian identity. He claims that all native-born Australians (meaning Australians of European background born in Australia) had an interest in building up a new Australian

[169] Ibid. pp. 101–103.
[170] Ibid. p. 94.
[171] Birrell, *Federation*, pp. 286 and 290.
[172] Evans et al., *1901*, p. 22.
[173] Birrell, *Federation*, 17.
[174] Ibid. pp. 1–23.

identity to get rid of the negative name 'colonial'.[175] For Birrell one of the main motors behind the federation movement, especially in Victoria, was the Australian Natives Association (ANA).[176] Birrell's interpretation of federation as the building of a unique Australian national identity signifies a return to views that were commonly held before World War Two when Federation was portrayed as a heroic achievement. As Stuart Macintyre remarks correctly there has been a recent 'revival of the heroic popular account of Federation'[177] and Bob Birrell is certainly a promoter of this movement.

Some of the federationists indeed were driven by nationalist ideals. John Hirst writes that some of the leaders in the federation movement genuinely thought that federation was a sacred union and that some of them truly believed that federation would overcome mutual suspicion and hostility between the colonies.[178] It is likely that some people campaigning for federation were keen on getting rid of their badge of colonial inferiority. Hirst writes that on a deeper level, the Queensland Premier Samuel Griffith fought for federation not because he wanted public affairs to be handled differently, but because he wanted to be someone different.[179]

But this already points to another motive in the federationists' struggle for the unification of the Australian colonies: personal interests and the wish to boost their careers. Henry Parkes who nowadays is known as 'Father of Federation', was very anxious to become a hero, to be known to the world as the man who created federation.[180] Parkes' speech at Tenterfield which made Parkes a legend did not attract a great deal of interest at the time.[181] Not surprisingly therefore, Parkes' motto 'One Nation, with One Destiny' was not realised in the constitution of the Commonwealth: 'it included no expression of any genuine national feeling' and many people – not least Aboriginal people – were terribly betrayed by the newly created nation.[182] Even Hirst admits that the people who fought for federation out of an emotional drive stayed a minority.[183] As laid

[175] Ibid. p. 105, see also p. 3.
[176] Ibid. p. 148. – The Australian Natives Association (ANA) was founded in Melbourne in 1871 as an organization that supported the (white) native born and only allowed the native born to become members. (Hirst, *The Sentimental Nation*, p. 36.)
[177] Stuart Macintyre, 'The Fortunes of Federation', *Makers of Miracles*, Headon and Williams (eds.), p. 14.
[178] Hirst, *The Sentimental Nation*, pp. 13–15.
[179] Ibid. pp. 28–29.
[180] Ibid. p. 87.
[181] Ibid. p. 89.
[182] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, p. 279.
[183] Hirst, *The Sentimental Nation*, p. 44.

out in the introduction Australians were not enthusiastic about federation and intercolonial rivalry were far from overcome after its achievement.

Federation may not have been a 'shabby deal' but to attribute the main motor of the federation movement to nationalism is not justified. Nationalism was one contributing factor within many. There was no popularly based nationalist movement and federation was mainly driven by people interested in national defence, trade, the movement towards 'White Australia' and last but not least, their own careers. Federation remains a formal foundation of a nation. Whether the creation of the Commonwealth of Australia in the long-term had the effect of increasing the feeling of an Australian national identity among the people is difficult to judge. But the indifferent attitude of many people around the time of federation time and the ongoing state rivalry after federation suggest that at least in the short-term, federation did not bring about a major increase in the awareness of an Australian 'imagined political community'.

2.4.2 Radical Ideas

By the end of the nineteenth century there was a type of political nationalism in Australia that was separate from and much more radical than the ideas of those federationists who underpinned their struggle for federation with nationalist arguments. It was the kind of nation that Henry Lawson and his mother Louisa dreamed of: they envisioned 'an Australian republic free of European royalty and nobility, free of class and corruption and the poles of great wealth and grinding poverty.'[184] Australia was to be governed by ordinary people.[185] This republicanism was a minority movement though: it was mainly found in parts of the working class and among writers, notably in the radical circles of the Sydney *Bulletin* and the Queensland *Boomerang*.[186] Among the federationists there was only one republican, Andrew Inglis Clark. It is also important to note that republicanism did not necessarily result in nationalism. On the contrary, Graeme Davison argues that only a few native-born secularists, such as the Lawsons, based a more distinctive nationalism on republicanism.[187]

[184] Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, p. 17.
[185] Alomes and Jones, *Australian Nationalism*, p. 74.
[186] Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, pp. 17 and 27.
[187] Graeme Davison, 'Sydney and the Bush: An Urban Context for the Australian Legend', *Historical Studies*, 18, 1978, p. 199. – See also: Teresa Pagliaro, 'Jose's Contribution at Angus & Robertson's to the

2.4.3 Art, Literature and the 'Bush Ethos'

The legend has it that only from the 1890s did Australian writers and artists begin to see their country 'with Australian eyes'. All art and literature produced in Australia before the 1890s are according to this legend a projection of the English landscape on Australia. This interpretation was attacked by Richard White in his work *Inventing Australia*. He concedes that in the 1890s there was a fresh approach in Australian art (the Heidelberg School) and literature, but he claims that this was just a change of taste and that both views of Australia were equally valid: 'What happened was that one standardised version of the Australian landscape had given way to another.'[188] So where did the legend come from? White explains that the legend, particularly popular in the 1920s and after the Second World War, can be traced back to the 'Bohemian boys', the artists and writers themselves. White asserts that promoting a nationalist interpretation of Australian cultural development lay in the financial interest of the 'Bohemian boys'. To maintain that their art was the only true and pure one was self-advertisement.[189] In 1933, this legend of the Nineties was fostered further in *The Romantic Nineties* a compilation of essays by Arthur Jose.[190] Even though Jose admits that the 1890s were 'a decade of unusual importance all the world over', he hastens to qualify that Australia was quite an exceptional case:

> *Our Australian Nineties, I am proud to believe, were a phenomenon of quite a different character. Far from being* fin-de-siècle, *they were the beginning of a new age, full of widespread excited pleasure in all its environment and eager at all costs to express it. Their whole spirit was healthily boyish, not adolescently revolutionary or boredly middle-aged.*[191]

During and after the Second World War, the notion of the Nineties as the formative period of Australian culture and society was promoted by writers like Vance and Nettie

---

Australian Literary Tradition', *History of Book Publishing in Australia Conference*, 30–31 October 1992, Papers, Anthony Robert Delves (ed.) (Australian Centre, Melbourne 1993) p. 1. Teresa Pagliaro makes clear that the old model of republican nationalism versus conservative imperialism is not adequate. Arthur Jose, editor of the *AE*, is an example to illustrate this: 'The phenomenon in which nationalism and imperialism were yoked together was colonial nationalism and Jose was one of its staunchest advocates.'

[188] White, *Inventing Australia*, p. 106.

[189] Ibid.

[190] Arthur Wilberforce Jose, *The Romantic Nineties* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1933). – See: Teresa Pagliaro, 'A.W. Jose and the Nineties: Living, Remembering, Constructing a Decade', *The 1890s: Australian Literature and Literary Culture*, Ken Stewart (ed.) (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) 1996) p. 313.

[191] Jose, *The Romantic Nineties*, pp. v–vi.

Palmer as well as other radical nationalists trying to unite the Australian nation against threats from outside (Japan) and wanting to prevent society from disintegrating.[192]

The 1890s may not have provided a special leverage in the creation of what the Australian nation is today. Other periods in Australian history were equally formative for the building of the modern Australian nation. But from the 1880s one can find definitive nationalist stirrings in Australian art and literature. As White writes, from the 1880s 'for the first time, a basic distinction was made between the image of Australia created by Europeans, and that created by Australians themselves'.[193]

It has been a common view in recent historiography that the writers of the Sydney *Bulletin* were prominent amongst those who tried to create a distinct national culture at the end of the nineteenth century. The *Bulletin* was a satirical weekly, founded by journalists Jules François Archibald and John Haynes and distributed for the first time in the streets of Sydney on 31 January 1880.[194] In the 1890s it contained a great range of different types of writings and illustrations, such as articles on political subjects, stories, poems, cartoons, letters, running debates, gossip, observations and jokeblocks.[195] Among others Henry Lawson and Banjo Paterson wrote for the journal. The editors of the *Bulletin* encouraged their readers to contribute to the journal and in 1892, there was a special call to the public to write on various subjects such as sport, mining, the bush and dramatic and social issues. This call was answered by thousands of Australians, in the cities as well as in the countryside.[196] The political subjects that were treated in the journal and the causes the *Bulletin* writers fought for were various and they changed over time. Before August 1894 a great deal was written about 'the coming republic' but after that, republicanism was considered to be less urgent than the federation of the colonies.[197] One of the recurring subjects in the *Bulletin* was immigration policy. The *Bulletin* supported the 'White Australia' Policy and other racist attitudes; caricatures on Chinese people, and Asians in general, were numerous.

---

[192] John Docker, *The Nervous Nineties: Australian Cultural Life in the 1890s* (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1991) p. xxi.
[193] White, *Inventing Australia*, p. 85.
[194] Sylvia Lawson, 'Print Circus: the *Bulletin* from 1880 to Federation', *Journalism: Print, Politics and Popular Culture*, Ann Curthoys and Julianne Schultz (eds.) (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) 1999) p. 84.
[195] Docker, *The Nervous Nineties*, p. 27.
[196] Lawson, 'Print Circus', p. 90.
[197] Ibid. p. 86.

Radical-nationalist historians and writers in the 1950s, ignoring the *Bulletin's* racism, interpreted the literary writings in the *Bulletin* as an expression of 'a spirit of social optimism, of egalitarianism and democracy, sharing and collectivity, irreverence and anti-authoritarianism.'[198] Russell Ward's *Australian Legend* of 1958 belongs to this school of writing. Ward traces the political attitudes expressed in the *Bulletin* back to what he calls 'the social attitudes of the pastoral proletariat'.[199] The main argument of Ward's study consists in the claim that from the 1890s, Australians saw their country's identity in the picture of the upcountry bushman. He claims that 'frontier conditions exerted a unifying, nationalist influence'[200].

The impact of Ward's work on historiography remains immense to the present day. Since 1958 numerous historians have dealt with Ward's approach, and his theory has been found inadequate in various ways. In particular, historians recently dealt with the question to what extent Australian identity at the end of the nineteenth century was independent from Britain. Richard White took issue with Ward's implicit claim that this 'bush ethos' was the only source for the developing Australian national identity.[201] Graeme Davison found fault with Ward's method of 'folk history', i.e. to draw direct conclusions from the analysis of literature.[202] Davison is referring to the writings of the Sydney *Bulletin*, but his critique can also be applied to the fact that Ward bases a good deal of his argument on the occurrence of a certain type of bush ballads and yarns.

It has now been established that Ward's statement that the ethos of the bushworkers was transferred from the outback to the rest of the population was unfounded. Richard White and Graeme Davison hold that the ' bush ethos' was developed in the city, not in the bush.[203] As Davison explains, the *Bulletin's* staple contributors (with the exception of only a few) and most of its occasional correspondents lived in the coastal cities, in Sydney and Melbourne.[204] Most of them had not grown up in the city but had come to the city from the declining goldfields. These young men usually

---

[198] John Docker, 'The Feminist Legend: A New Historicism?', *Debutante Nation: Feminism Contests the 1890s*, Susan Magarey et al. (ed.) (Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards 1993) p. 16.
[199] Russell Ward, *The Australian Legend* (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1958) p. 224.
[200] Ward, *The Australian Legend*, p. 241. – Ward bases this argument on F.J. Turner's 'frontier theory'. (See for example: Frederick Jackson Turner, *Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*, E.E. Edwards (ed.) (University of Wisconsin Press, Madison 1938).)
[201] White, *Inventing Australia*, chapter 6, see especially pp. 103–104.
[202] Davison, 'Sydney and the Bush', p. 192.
[203] White, *Inventing Australia*. See especially p. 98. – Davison, ' Sydney and the Bush', pp. 191–209.
[204] For this and the following see: Davison, 'Sydney and the Bush', pp. 192–200.

stayed in lodgings, abounding in Sydney, a city that was struggling with severe overpopulation in the late 1880s. The problems of an overcrowded city in connection with radical ideas inherited from Britain drove the *Bulletin* writers to idealise the bush and to demonise the city. Their imagery – as Davison remarks – 'owed less to observation of the Sydney scene than to the rich stock of urban imagery which the *Bulletin*'s "hard-reading crowd", along with other colonial city-dwellers, imported from London.'[205] Thus, Davison reasons, the ideology of Sydney's radical intellectuals was projected onto the outback, thereby creating the myth that Ward described, incorporating values of 'anticlericalism', 'nationalism', 'bush' sentiment and 'race prejudice'. In short, what took place in the 1890s in Davison's eyes was 'the projection onto the outback of values revered by an alienated urban intelligentsia',[206] including first and foremost the writers of the Sydney *Bulletin*.

Ken Stewart maintains that the opposition between city and bush was not as distinct as Davison suggests. Stewart therefore demands that the Ward and the Davison theses should be 'fused and refashioned into a less ambitious proposition'.[207] Marilyn Lake on the other hand agrees with Davison and takes his argument even further by holding that the bohemian writers of the Sydney *Bulletin* were promoting a particular type of masculinity with the creation of the bush ethos: the bush worker as opposed to the domestic man. Lake maintains that the writers of the *Bulletin* were heavy drinkers, smokers and gamblers, had firm views on gender relationships, valued masculine camaraderie and thus projected these views on the bush workers.[208] Along these lines, Lake gives an additional explanation why the male nationalist writers idealised the pastoral workers: 'they did so because in their apparent freedom from the ties of family and in their "independence", these bushmen most closely approximated to their masculinist ideal.'[209]

Sylvia Lawson with justification pointed out that Lake and other recent historians were just as one-sided in their perspective on the *Bulletin* as the radical-nationalist historians. Whereas earlier writers only saw the journal's positive sides, interpreting it as

[205] Ibid. p. 200.
[206] Ibid. p. 208.
[207] Ken Stewart, 'Introduction', *The 1890s: Australian Literature and Literary Culture*, Ken Stewart (ed.) (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) 1996) pp. 13–14.
[208] Marilyn Lake, 'The Politics of Respectability: Identifying the Masculinist Context', *Historical Studies*, 22 (86), 1986, pp. 117–118.
[209] Lake, 'The Politics of Respectability', p. 120.

a voice for republican nationalism and a stage for the promotion of literature, Lake and other historians of her generation only saw the journal's negative sides, its racism and misrepresentation of gender.[210] Lawson accounts for this flaw by trying to understand the *Bulletin* in its complexity. John Docker who agrees with Lawson in many ways found some interesting images to describe the journal's many facets. In his work *The Nervous Nineties* he calls the *Bulletin* of the 1890s 'a heady contradictory cocktail, a drunken boat, a ship of witty fools'.[211] Both Docker and Lawson also point out that the writers of the *Bulletin* were not always idealising the bush.[212] Docker reminds us that Henry Lawson was involved in a long argument with Banjo Paterson, in the pages of the *Bulletin*, over the subject of the bush: Lawson heavily criticised Paterson's eulogies to the bush and painted a much bleaker picture of the bush, one of hard work, loneliness and 'maddening flies'.[213] But after Lawson's death in 1922 he soon became a national symbol and his legacy was used and interpreted by various political parties and organisations with very differing interests. Whereas people on the left emphasised Lawson's working class background and his sympathy for workers, conservatives had a keen interest in refashioning the myths of the radical nationalists and therefore highlighted Lawson's writing on the bush. Soon after Lawson's death, a committee was founded whose goal it was to erect a statue in memory of the poet, and the members of the committee were very eager that Lawson would be represented as a man of the bush.[214] It was thus in the course of the canonisation of Henry Lawson's work after his death, that by some he was portrayed more and more as the great writer of the Australian bush.

Nevertheless it cannot be denied that in the 1890s Australian writers showed a lot of interest in rural life.[215] Does it matter if some of these writings were not favourable towards the bush? Is the fact that these Australians constantly wrote about the bush, thereby presenting Australia as something distinctly different from Britain, not enough to qualify these writings as contributors to the creation of a distinct national identity? What is more, the *Bulletin* achieved something else apart from a popularisation of the bush. The journal had a very high circulation – around 100,000 copies in a population of about three

[210] Lawson, 'Print Circus', p. 94. See also: Sylvia Lawson, *The Archibald Paradox: a Strange Case of Authorship* (Penguin, Ringwood (VIC) 1987).
[211] Docker, *The Nervous Nineties*, p. 69.
[212] Lawson, 'Print Circus', p. 92. – Docker, 'The Feminist Legend', p. 21.
[213] Docker, 'The Feminist Legend', p. 21.
[214] Christopher Lee, *City Bushman: Henry Lawson and the Australian Imagination* (Curtin University Press, Fremantle 2004) p. 100.
[215] Even Docker admits this. (Docker, 'The Feminist Legend', p. 22.)

million at the turn of the century –[216] and, as Lawson highlighted, people both read the *Bulletin* and contributed to it:

> *Every week, in the bush and the new suburbs alike, they were rescued from colonial mediocrity; they were among the famous and notorious, sharing the same columns, the same styles as princes and opera-singers. Readers were made writers, audience and performers mingled and changed places; the relations of centre and periphery were unstable and dynamic.*[217]

These are very important observations but unfortunately Lawson does not draw any conclusions from them. She does not seem to notice that what she describes is strongly reminiscent of Anderson's description of imagined communities. Christopher Lee in his work on Henry Lawson observed that the *Bulletin* was 'proactive in imagining that [broad, popular and heterogeneous, N.K.] audience as a national community'.[218] The *Bulletin* stimulated people's imagination of the Australian nation. Anderson argues that

> *the newspaper is merely an 'extreme form' of the book, a book sold on a colossal scale, but of ephemeral popularity. Might we say: one-day-bestsellers? The obsolescence of the newspaper on the morrow of its printing (…) creates this extraordinary mass ceremony: the almost precisely simultaneous consumption ('imagining') of the newspaper-as-fiction. We know that particular morning and evening editions will overwhelmingly be consumed between this hour and that, only on this day, not that. (…) The significance of this mass ceremony – Hegel observed that newspapers serve modern man as a substitute for morning prayers – is paradoxical. It is performed in silent privacy, in the lair of the skull. Yet each communicant is well aware that the ceremony he performs is being replicated simultaneously by thousands (or millions) of others of whose existence he is confident, yet of whose identity he has not the slightest notion. Furthermore, this ceremony is incessantly repeated at daily or half-daily intervals throughout the calendar. What more vivid figure for the secular, historically clocked, imagined community can be envisioned?*[219]

One could object that the *Bulletin* was only a weekly journal and that therefore its readers did not necessarily read it on the same day, at the same hours. But it can still be argued that the *Bulletin* had the force to unite more and more Australians – not in the sense of social and political harmony but in the sense of producing an imagined community. The *Bulletin* was distributed at short, regular intervals and it spread fast from the city to rural areas, gaining a national readership.[220] Its readers, much more than readers of a regular newspaper, were part of the *Bulletin* themselves. They not only read what other members of the imagined community had to say but wrote contributions themselves.

---

[216] Lawson, 'Print Circus', p. 87.
[217] Ibid. p. 92.
[218] Lee, *City Bushman*, p. 21.
[219] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, pp. 34–35.
[220] Stephen Alomes describes the *Bulletin* as 'the Sydney weekly with a national readership'. (Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, p. 14.)

Thus it can be said that the *Bulletin* furthered the creation of an Australian nation. Furthermore the policy on its contributors signified a conscious effort towards a national culture. The editors of the *Bulletin* also published works written in the Australian idiom and they paid local contributors – contrary to the prevalent English orientation.[221] Finally, the writings of the *Bulletin* did not remain confined to the journal itself but resulted in the publication of collections by its writers, principally Henry Lawson and A.B. 'Banjo' Paterson. These separate publications in turn had their own influence.

2.4.4 Sport and War: Nation Building through Contest?

Sport, especially Australian Rules Football and cricket, is another factor in the Australian nation building process. That cricket could provide a unifying experience to the Australian colonies was already recognised in the 1870s.[222] As Graeme Davison put it: 'By the end of the nineteenth century, as the colonies moved towards federation, sport provided a symbolic arena in which Australia could rehearse its identity as united and independent state.'[223] By the 1912 Olympics in Stockholm, Australian and New Zealander athletes were participating as a separate group from the British.[224] Sport popularised Australian emblems and symbols even before Federation.[225]

However, the concept of the Australian nation and its sportsmen was still competing with the notion of Australasian athletes, as the interchangeably used terms 'Australian' and 'Australasian' in newspapers like the *Sydney Morning Herald* indicate.[226] Sporting contests could also work against the building of an Australian national community. Cricket was played on two levels, between the different colonies and between Australia and its mother country in the test matches. Whereas the matches between Australian and British teams probably had a unifying effect on the Australian colonies, the intercolonial matches most likely worked in the opposite direction, strengthening intercolonial rivalry and competition.[227] Stephen Alomes maintains that cricketing relations worked more in favour of dependence rather than independence of

[221] Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, p. 15.
[222] Mandle, 'Cricket', p. 240.
[223] Graeme Davison, 'The Imaginary Grandstand: International Sport and the Recognition of Australian Identity', *The Imaginary Grandstand: Identity and Narrative in Australian Sport*, Bernard Whimpress (ed.) (Australian Society for Sports History, Kent Town (SA) 2002) p. 15.
[224] Davison, 'Imaginary Grandstand', p. 16.
[225] Richard Cashman, *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades* (Walla Walla Press, Sydney 2002) p. 71.
[226] Davison, 'Imaginary Grandstand', p. 16.
[227] McLachlan, *Waiting for the Revolution*, p. 156. – See also: Evans et al., *1901*, p. 241.

Australia because cricket was 'an ideological instrument of British rule'.[228] One should not forget that both cricket and football were of British origin. Although AFL was invented in Australia, it drew a great deal from British soccer.[229] Thus sport in the decades around federation strengthened Australia's ties with Britain as well as giving Australia an arena for nation building efforts.

The Boer War and the First World War had similarly ambiguous consequences. Both wars had the effect of confusing the loyalties of the Australian people. When the Boer War broke out, the Australian colonies sent troops to support the British in South Africa. But there was opposition to the war, including from the *Bulletin* and eminent individuals, for example George Arnold Wood, history professor at the University of Sydney, or the Labour Opposition Leader in Queensland, Andrew Dawson.[230] When the war was finished and the last veterans returned to Australia, they found that the Australian people were quite eager to forget the war: 'Defending the empire had (…) not fulfilled its promise of asserting nationhood and creating a national myth based on blood sacrifice.'[231] In the next war Australians fought in, the First World War, the soldiers had to meet high expectations. It was the first war Australians fought in after federation, and already before the war, the demands to the Australian soldier were clear. He was required to be a hero and nothing less. Many saw the First World War as Australia's final entry into nationhood. In fight and bloodshed Australia's maturity and strength as a nation was to be proved. But, as Stuart Macintyre stresses, many Australians believed that Britain was endangered and supported the war out of an ethnic loyalty as well as because of self-interest.[232]

Out of all the battles Australians were involved in during the First World War, the landing of the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps (ANZAC) at Gallipoli on the 25 April 1915 and the subsequent battles on the peninsula soon became *the* symbol for the suffering and heroic fighting of the Australian soldiers. This was despite the fact that many more Australians died in the defence of France than at Gallipoli. The term 'Anzac' became to signify 'a citizen soldier with the distinctive qualities of the settler societies from which he sprang, resourceful and willing'. Another more colloquial term for these

[228] Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, p. 94.
[229] Cashman, *Sport*, p. 166.
[230] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, pp. 59–62.
[231] Ibid. pp. 64.
[232] Macintyre, *A Concise History*, p. 166.

soldiers became 'digger', alluding to the egalitarian attitudes ascribed to the golddiggers.[233] But, asks Noel McLachlan quite rightly, 'how could invading Turkey in a corps mixing New Zealanders and Australians (under an English corps commander) as a small part of a multi-national force (French as well) (...) have secured Australian nationhood?'[234] McLachlan's answer to that is simple: any sacrifice was considered to be better than none.[235] But did the First World War really have a unifying effect on the Australian nation? Stephen Alomes claims that the First World War both united and divided Australia at the same time. On the one hand, the war brought about a clearer sense of the Australian nation, but on the other hand, the war always stayed within an imperial context. What is more, during the war, Australia was by no means unified in their views about the war, especially about the subject of conscription.[236]

Already in the first year after the war, the landing at Gallipoli was commemorated by Australian war veterans. Soon Anzac Day became an official holiday; the Anzac legend thrived. Its beginning lay in the reports about the initial landing at Gallipoli given by the official British war correspondent. It was further promoted by Australian war correspondents, in particular by C.E.W. Bean who later wrote the official history of Australia in the First World War. The romanticising of the Australian digger caused a revival of the Australian bush ethos, but this time, the Australian legend took a definitive turn to the right of the political spectrum. Anzac Day became a forum for conservative values such as loyalty to and conformity with the state and acceptance of middle-class quiescence.[237] This new version of the Australian Legend was also connected with loyalty to the Empire.[238] At the same time, a new trend in Australian literature is visible that ran contrary to the loyalties towards the empire. Richard Nile writes:

> *Europe is questioned, perhaps for the first time in Australian literature. I don't mean that the* Bulletin *never published republican-inspired work in the 1890s, or that there was never nationalism in Australian literature before Sarajevo: rather what I am getting at is that the centrality of European modes of thinking, cast now in the shadow of the war experience, called for a substantial and significant reassessment.*[239]

[233] Ibid. p. 158.
[234] McLachlan, *Waiting for the Revolution,* p. 197.
[235] Ibid. p. 198.
[236] Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, pp. 62–63.
[237] Ibid. p. 67.
[238] Alomes, *Australian Nationalism,* p. 163.
[239] Richard Nile, 'The Australian Legend and its Discontents', *Becoming Australia,* Richard Nile and Michael Peterson (eds.) (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) 1998) p. 159.

As much as war and sport confused Australian loyalties, both nevertheless boosted the pride and self-esteem of the developing Australian nation: The fact that Australians proved themselves in the tests of war and, on a less serious level, at sport, helped to relieve Australians from the fear of being inferior to the British.[240]

2.5 The Achievement of Encyclopaedias

The factors and forces treated above are the most discussed in recent historiography on the emergence of the Australian nation. As demonstrated, literature and sport and war were more influential in early Australian nation building than federation and radical political views. Federation did not generate a great deal of interest in the public and radical nationalists stayed a minority. Sport and war, although they also had the effect of confusing Australian loyalties, managed to boost the self-confidence of many Australians. The single most important factor remains literature, notably the Sydney *Bulletin*. Individual authors like Henry Lawson were influential, not so much through their actual life and work but through the use that was made of them and their work. The 'bush ethos' as such was for a long time greatly overestimated by historians and its authorship has often been attributed to the wrong people. Nevertheless, it existed and had a share in the creation of the Australian nation.

The fact that literature had such a unifying effect on Australia points to an important characteristic, or the core, of nation building: it is an interaction between reality and construction. In nation building processes, particular aspects or fragments of a society are (consciously or not) used to construct an imaginary whole which in turn influences the society concerned. The construction of this imaginary whole can be achieved through a variety of media, but often it happens through the medium of language. The *Bulletin* and Henry Lawson's work were such linguistic constructions built from fragments of society, which in turn influenced the Australian society by stimulating the idea of an imagined community. The Anzac Legend, constructed in the medium of language as well as visual art – one thinks of the numerous monuments devoted to the diggers – achieved the same. Both the *Bulletin* and Henry Lawson's work were also significant on a meta level. After Lawson's death his work and life were used by people of various political persuasions to make statements about Australian society as a whole, be it through the medium of language or art. Radical-nationalists did the same with their interpretation of the *Bulletin*.

[240] See for example: White, *Inventing Australia*, pp. 72–73.

The core of successful nation building, an interaction between society and construction, coincides with the achievement of encyclopaedias. Encyclopaedias select certain aspects of society for a linguistic construction of a whole, which in turn influences the society the encyclopaedia is situated in. In contrast to other such places of negotiation, such as fictitious literature, encyclopaedias are not only analytical and taxonomic in their approach but also by definition transform views into general knowledge and give subjective views and opinions an air of objectivity. Encyclopaedias are the ideal instrument for nation building. The choice of encyclopaedias as a source for research on the Australian nation building process is thus doubly motivated. Encyclopaedias are not only particularly suitable for research on nation building because they are supposed to present society as a whole, but their aptitude for nation building efforts also urgently asks for research on their political significance.

3 A New Meaning for an Old Genre

3.1 The Origins of the Australian Encyclopaedia

On the 10 August 1910 David Patrick, one of the editors of *Chambers* in Edinburgh, wrote to Jose:

> *They [Messr Chambers of Edinburgh, N.K.] are preparing a completely revised reissue of their Encyclopaedia, for which many of the principal articles will be entirely rewritten, and a still larger number thoroughly revised and partially rewritten (as far as may be found necessary).*
>
> *Will you undertake for us the revision of the Australian articles, rewriting such articles, sections or paragraphs as you may think best?*[241]

Jose accepted this offer immediately, first in a cable message, then in a letter.[242] During his employment with W&R Chambers Jose not only rewrote Australian articles (or sections of articles) but also produced new articles concerning Australian subjects. His suggestions for changes were often taken up readily by the editors of the encyclopaedia. On the article 'Australia' that Jose rewrote for *Chambers* he remarked:

> *I have also taken particular care to correct popular errors about the climate, the inhabitants (human and other), the literature, &c., of which far too many are repeated nowadays by authors who ought to know better, or at least to verify instead of merely copying their references.*[243]

Jose was very keen on correcting what he considered to be misconceptions about Australia. The correspondence between Jose and the editors of *Chambers* shows that Jose was eager to draw a favourable picture of Australia. His ambition to rectify Australia's image in Britain was not restricted to his work for *Chambers*. In the *The Romantic Nineties*, Jose wrote:

> *A friend told me many years afterwards that I was not so much correspondent of* The Times *in Australia as correspondent of Australia in* The Times*; and there was much truth in the statement. I had undertaken the task neither for my sake nor for that of* The Times*, but in order to get the truth told about Australia.*[244]

When Jose first arrived in Australia from England as a nineteen-year old, he did not like the country. Born in Bristol in 1863, he was the first child of the merchant and

[241] Letter from David Patrick on 10 August 1910 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[242] Letter from Jose on 21 September 1910 to Patrick, NLS: Dep. 341/400. The original of this document is contained in NAA: AWM39, 6. The list with suggestions from Jose is missing there though.
[243] Letter from Jose on 27 May 1914 to 'the editor' (*Chambers's Encyclopaedia*), NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[244] Jose, *The Romantic Nineties*, p. 88.

alderman William Wilberforce Jose and his wife Sarah.[245] His success as a student at Clifton College gained him a scholarship to study at Oxford. A year later Jose not only left Oxford, but England altogether. Failing health has been mentioned as a reason for his departure,[246] but Teresa Pagliaro, who wrote her PhD thesis about Jose's contribution to Australian literary culture, is sceptical about this argument:

> *It has been said that his health broke down: this may well be true but it should be remembered that throughout the nineteenth century, ill-health became something of a convention used to explain away the misdemeanours of the young, or financial embarrassments of elders. For the idea of living in Australia was rarely thought desirable.*[247]

Whatever the reasons for Jose's departure, he arrived in Melbourne in November 1882, having just turned nineteen. He spent the first couple of months in Tasmania, undertaking various jobs. In the following years, Jose worked as a teacher, first at Hawthorn Grammar School in Melbourne, then, after a time wandering around Tasmania, at All Saints' College in Bathurst.

It seems that Jose was quite unhappy during the first years he spent in Australia. Pagliaro quotes a letter by Jose in which he called Australia a 'Godforsaken country', a place where he felt intellectually and spiritually isolated, a place that made him long for Oxford.[248] But Jose's attitude towards Australia changed dramatically in the 1890s. Pagliaro sees an indication for this change of mind in Jose's choice of pen-name for his first publication, a publication that was at the same time one of the first publications by Angus & Robertson. Jose's book of poetry *Sun and Cloud on River and Sea* was published under the name of Ishmael Dare, often shortened to I. Dare, a pun on 'Jose' or French 'j'ose'. Whereas this pen-name could be interpreted in a negative way – the biblical Ishmael as a social outcast or a vagabond – it can also be read in a more positive way:

> *By his public use of the name, Ishmael, and by the pun 'I Dare', we see Jose's adoption of a different persona, we see him accepting his place in what he once regarded as a 'Godforsaken country'.*[249]

---

[245] For this and the following biographical information on Arthur Wilberforce Jose see: Pagliaro, *Jose.* See also: R. Lamont, 'Jose, Arthur Wilberforce (1863–1934)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography* (Australian National University, online edition 2006). (adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A090521b.htm, accessed 24 May 07.)
[246] So for example in the Australian Dictionary of Biography: Lamont, 'Jose, Arthur Wilberforce'.
[247] Pagliaro, *Jose*, p. 32.
[248] Ibid. p. 35.
[249] Ibid. p. 38.

One of the reasons for Jose's new attitude may have been the fact that he considered the 1890s to be an entirely new era for Australia.[250]

In any case Jose had changed his mind about Australia and was intent on becoming an ambassador for his adopted country. Interestingly, Jose was a confidant of Alfred Deakin, a leader in the federation movement and later the second Prime Minister of Australia. Between 1905 and 1912 Deakin and Jose corresponded regularly.[251] However, Jose's Australian nationalism remained in an imperial context. This combination of Australian nationalism and loyalty to the Empire led Pagliaro to describe Jose as a 'colonial nationalist'.[252] Jose's dual loyalties seem to have included an ambiguous sense of 'home'. Sometimes he connected the concept with England, sometimes with Australia, as his use of the pronouns 'we', 'us' and 'they' show. In Jose's letters, 'we' sometimes refers to Australia and 'they' to Britain. In other cases, he uses the pronouns exactly the other way round. One and the same letter may be evidence for this conflicting use of pronouns. In 1912 Jose wrote to David Patrick, apologising for not having written earlier and explaining that his wife had been ill. His apology starts with the following sentence:

> *By this time you must be convinced that another contributor has 'died on you', as they say out here.*[253]

Here Jose uses 'they' to refer to Australia. A bit further down, mentioning the *Chambers* article 'arbitration', he writes:

> *Australia is the only country I know which has made any attempt to found its arbitration laws on definite conceptions, either of the 'living wage' or of the arbitration unit. Furthermore, it seems to be the only country which coordinates its policies of defence, protection, and industrial legislation so that they are mutually interdependent – therein, by the by, lies the mistake that Britain will make if she borrows our compulsory arbitration laws. You can't borrow a bit of our system without the rest.*[254]

Jose starts his comments with a neutral formulation, employing the article 'it' when referring to Australia and neither marking Australia as 'ours' or 'theirs'. Interestingly though, he finishes the paragraph off by calling Australia's arbitration laws 'ours'. The context of Jose's identification with Australia is revealing. It is in connection with

[250] See for example: Jose, *The Romantic Nineties*, pp. v–vi.
[251] Pagliaro, *Jose*, p. 43.
[252] Ibid. p. 3.
[253] Letter from Jose on 30 July 1912 to Patrick, NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[254] Ibid.

praising Australia for its arbitration laws that he identifies with the country. Jose is displaying Australian national pride.

If Jose was so keen on conveying a 'true' and positive picture of Australia, the question becomes essential whether this was only a personal quest or whether Jose was also acting on behalf of someone else. By 1910, Jose had not only written books on Australasian history and the British Empire, but also been an editor at Angus & Robertson for many years.[255] Was it perhaps also the wish of George Robertson to present a positive picture of Australia to the users of *Chambers*? Caroline Viera Jones, in her PhD thesis on George Robertson's influence on the Australian national narrative, writes that Robertson was very keen on spreading uniquely Australian knowledge. On the production of the *AE* Jones remarks:

> *When the anglophile Arthur Jose left the encyclopaedia unfinished, he also allowed George Robertson the chance to break free from conservative editing and to insert ideas outside the academy. His dream was to pass onto (sic!) posterity a body of knowledge which was uniquely Australian. The encyclopaedia is ample evidence that he succeeded in this endeavour.*[256]

Jones seems not to have understood that 'the anglophile Arthur Jose' was 'australophile' at the same time and like Robertson keen to spread knowledge on Australia in Britain. Did Robertson suggest to Chambers that Jose would be an appropriate contributor?

In the letter asking Jose to work for Chambers, Patrick writes that he had been 'encouraged by Mr Thomson of Messrs Angus and Robertson' to make his request to Jose.[257] Richard Thomson was an employee of Angus & Robertson who used to be the New Zealand manager of George Robertson, bookseller and publisher in Melbourne (no relation to George Robertson of Sydney). Later Thomson became a member of the firm of Angus & Robertson and finally Chairman of Directors.[258] Although the original letter by Richard Thomson seems to be lost, an extract of it survived:

> *Re Mr Jose I got along all right – they called in Dr Patrick their Editor who was very pleased to fall in with the proposal, said it was of very great service to them etc etc & is writing Mr Jose in a mail or so telling him what they want & what they will be prepared to pay & asking him to cable his acceptance. So you will have to tell Jose what <u>you</u> want & I have no doubt Chas. will be only too pleased to fall in with it. Dr P. said they felt their Colonial articles Canada,*

[255] Pagliaro, *Jose*, pp. 42–43. For example, Jose had worked with Henry Lawson on *While the Billy Boils*.
[256] Jones, *Australian Imprint*, p. 336.
[257] Letter from Patrick on 10 August 1910 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[258] George Ferguson, *Some Early Australian Bookmen* (Australian National University Press, Canberra 1978) p. 26.

> *Austr. & S.A. were most in need of revision so the whole thing came at an opportune time & the fact that Jose was 'Times' Correspondent had great weight with them, they had previously written Sir Geo. Reid re something of the kind but had not received a reply. I said I was sure J. would be of much more service to them, and even if Reid did it the work would probably be devilled by some clerk & they might get him to read the articles later, & so be able to make some use of his name.*
>
> *Dr Patrick had quite taken up the notion of a supplementary volume, & I believe if Jose satisfies them over the first work they would give him the latter to do if they go on with it.*[259]

It is neither clear who excerpted the letter by Thomson nor is the letter's addressee known. But since Chambers is treated like a third party, it is very likely that the addressee was someone within Angus & Robertson, most likely George Robertson. Who would otherwise have been asked to tell Jose 'what they (in the letter 'you') want'? It seems it was George Robertson who had told Richard Thomson to suggest Jose as a reviser to Chambers. It can thus be assumed that Robertson just like Jose was eager to paint a favourable picture of Australia in the Scottish encyclopaedia.

The last sentence of the above quote is interesting. It shows that a supplementary volume to *Chambers* was planned and that the original idea for the supplementary volume was not Patrick's. Did the suggestion perhaps come from the side of Angus & Robertson? Had George Robertson not only asked Thomson to recommend Jose to W & R Chambers but also to suggest the production of an additional volume with Jose as an editor? Was this supplementary volume what later became the Sydney produced *AE*? Wiley's reminiscences support the argument that the *AE* had been George Robertson's idea. Wiley explains that

> *This had been on his [George Robertson's, N.K.] mind for some years, one day as far back as 1909–1910, we were looking up something in Chambers Ency, at Mosman, & GR remarked, I'd like to publish an Aus*^{an} *Ency, but it would be a colossal undertaking, even the preliminaries would take perhaps years – still difficulties were meant to be overcome, & I may have a try at it.*[260]

George Robertson, following his strong wish to spread the kind of knowledge about Australia he approved of, may have got Jose in the door of W & R Chambers. Jose, being just as keen to convey a positive picture of Australia seemed to have been the right person to do the job.

[259] Document titled 'Extract from Mr Thompson's letter', 4 August 1910, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[260] Wiley Reminiscences, ML: MS 5238 (pp. 345–346).

That the *AE* was to be explicitly modelled on the basis of *Chambers* is apparent in correspondence between Jose and various authors of the *AE*. In a letter to the author Herbert Ray, Jose explains:

> *We are almost at once sending the matter for vol.1 of the encyclopaedia to Edinburgh to be printed by Chambers, as the volume is to be uniform with their encyclopaedia.*[261]

The *AE* was not printed by Chambers in the end, but by Eagle Press Limited in Australia, a company for which Angus & Robertson had acquired a controlling interest in 1923.[262] But the letter shows that both Jose and Robertson intended to produce the *AE* along the lines of *Chambers*. Rebecca Wiley, secretary of George Robertson, recalls in her reminiscences of Angus & Robertson that it was 'GR's cherished ambition – to bring out an all Australian Encyclopaedia uniform & as two supplementary volumes of Chamber's (sic!) Ency.'[263] The promotion of the *AE* as a supplement to *Chambers* led in 1918 Walter Baldwin Spencer, author of various articles for the *AE*, to call the *AE* 'Chambers':

> *I had thought that lack of paper would probably postpone for some time the publishing of 'Chambers' & therefore have not as yet written my articles though I have been getting notes together.*[264]

But why was *Chambers* used as a model and not the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* that was usually used as a reference point in the Anglo-Saxon world? Partly it may have had to do with Robertson's Scottish background. Although Robertson was born in England (at Gosfield near Halstead, Essex, 1860), his parents were Scottish, and after his father's death, when he was only seven, the family moved to Glasgow. After emigrating first to New Zealand Robertson came to Sydney in 1882, where he soon started to work in the Sydney branch of the Melbourne bookseller George Robertson. By 1886 he bought himself into the bookseller's business of David Mackenzie Angus, a former work colleague at George Robertson's bookshop. The business of these two men became the bookseller's and publishing firm Angus & Robertson Ltd in 1907. According to Caroline Viera Jones, Robertson was always proud of his Scottish ancestry.[265] Jones does not reference this claim. But the fact that the emblem of Angus & Robertson, preceding the

[261] Letter from Jose on 11 September 1923 to S.H. Ray, NLA: MS 708.
[262] 'Administrative History', *Guide to the Angus & Robertson Archives* (State Library of New South Wales, Sydney 2000).
[263] Wiley Reminiscences, ML: MS 5238 (pp. 287–288).
[264] Letter from Walter Baldwin Spencer on 16 August 1918 to Herbert James Carter, NLA: MS 708.
[265] Jones, *Australian Imprint*, p. 27.

title page of the second volume of the *AE*, combined a Scottish symbol with an Australian one, the thistle with the waratah, suggests that Jones is right.[266]

The choice of *Chambers* might also have had practical reasons. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* was an enormous work – the fourteenth edition of the *Britannica* published in 1929 consisted of 25 volumes – and to produce a supplementary volume to it might have been much more than Angus & Robertson's resources allowed. In 1921, Jose told Walter Baldwin Spencer:

> *Please don't think we are emulating the Britannica. My brain reels at the mere thought. We are following on the Chambers lines: and that's a monstrous job for two men.*[267]

Robertson does not seem to have had anti-imperialist reasons for choosing *Chambers* over the prototypical *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. On practical matters, the producers had no problems relying on the authority of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Jose liked following the *Britannica's* spelling of words.[268] Furthermore, Jose had nothing against the use of the content of the *Britannica*, as a letter to an author of the *AE* demonstrates: 'I have added, from the Enc. Brit., a sentence about the anatomy of the neck. Do you approve?'[269]

So to what extent was *Chambers* used as a model for the *AE*? The evidence for an answer to this question may be found in three sources: firstly, there is the extensive correspondence on the production of the *AE*. To what extent was the *AE* planned to be modelled on *Chambers*? Secondly, there are the prefaces and other paratexts and pictures belonging to the encyclopaedia. How were the encyclopaedias presented to their readers? Did the producers of the *AE* make it explicit to their readers that the work was supposed to be modelled on the Scottish encyclopaedia? And finally there are the encyclopaedias themselves. Did the result correspond with the implicit ideals and the presentation of the knowledge?

3.2 Chambers *as a Model for the* Australian Encyclopaedia

According to Pagliaro, between 1919 and 1925, when Jose left Angus & Robertson, the relationship between Jose and Robertson became 'increasingly strained'. It

[266] See: *AE*, vol. 2. – To be just to Jones one has to say that at another point in her thesis she also mentions this fact. (Jones, *Australian Imprint*, p. 305).
[267] Letter from Jose on 25 October 1921 to Spencer, NLA: MS 708.
[268] See for example: Letter from Jose on 13 March 1922 to W.B. Alexander, ML: MS 314/41.
[269] Letter from Jose on 16 March 1922 to Alexander, ML: MS 314/41.

was many years until 'Robertson was civil to him [i.e. Jose, N.K.]' again.[270] This tension between Robertson and Jose dates at least from 1916, when Jose received a letter from Fred Shenstone, the company secretary and nominal manager of the publishing department of Angus & Robertson, informing him that:

> *We propose to make a start in January towards finishing the revision of the Encyclopaedia. In order to do the job properly it will be necessary to bring all the material to Sydney and make a fresh start.*
>
> *As your time seems to be fully occupied you will probably be glad to get the thing off your hands.*[271]

Robertson does not seem to have been satisfied with what he considered to be the extent of Jose's commitment. However it is doubtful that Robertson was serious about dismissing Jose and employing somebody else for the editing of the encyclopaedia. This emerges from the correspondence following Shenstone's letter. Jose resisted his dismissal and told Robertson that he did not believe

> *you'll get anyone at present in Sydney to do it [completing the encyclopaedia, N.K.] decently; there are very few really sound historical researchers there, and not one of them that I know of has a decent straightforward concise style (note the implication that I have).*[272]

After Jose had written a second letter, Robertson replied:

> *I thought I had replied to yours of 25th. Jan. I meant to and, if I had, its tenor would have been go on with the Ency. by all means. There's nobody will do it half so well. Mr. Carter began on 1st. inst. with the scientific side of the book. I think he will make a good job of it.*[273]

It seems like the purpose of Shenstone's letter was more to give Jose a scare in order to make him work harder rather than dismissing him.

But Robertson's mind does not seem to have been settled after this incident. A letter by Jose shows that Robertson still worried about whether Jose spent enough time on the production of the encyclopaedia. The letter also reveals that Jose was not satisfied with the situation either. Jose wrote:

> *I hear from Carter that you dread my joining the I.W.W. or some similar body concerned with the slowing-down process in relation to Encyclopaedias. Dry those tears and hush that trembling spirit.*

---

[270] Pagliaro, *Jose*, p. 307.
[271] Letter from Fred Shenstone on 2 December 1916 to Jose, ML: MS 341/41.
[272] Letter from Jose on 6 December 1916 to Robertson, ML: ZML A7273.
[273] Letter from Robertson on 6 March 1917 to Jose, ML: MS 314/41.

> *But I shall be slower than a few days ago I hoped to be. When Shenstone came down, he told me he was going to leave me the Elizabeth House room to work in: and it was an excellent idea, as I have – every second week – several hours to spare during the afternoon, and could easily get along with the work if it were spread out handily in town to be taken up as convenient. But it turns out that all he can leave me is the bare room with one chair and two packing-cases to work on – and that does not appeal to me. I had hoped to have a decent table and some shelving on which to arrange the articles in separate piles.*
>
> *As it is, I shall have to get along in the old way, getting an article out of the piled-up mass in a cupboard and hiking it into town and out when at work on it. This must be a slower process, and one which cannot take advantage of odd moments: but I will go on steadily as I can.*
>
> *Rest assured that Carter and I will work quite frictionlessly.*[274]

There is an obvious menace lying between the lines: Jose is warning Robertson that if he does not supply him with a proper workplace the production of the encyclopaedia would be slowed down considerably. That, as we have seen, was the last thing Robertson wished for. Robertson must have given in more or less immediately, as less than three weeks later, Jose thanked Robertson for the 'suggested arrangements about the room. I have bought a table, two chairs, and a cupboard with shelves above it (…) and am moving Encyclopaedia stuff in tomorrow.'[275]

The second crisis in the relationship between Jose and Robertson came in 1919, before Jose was employed full-time by Angus & Robertson for his work on the encyclopaedia. At that point, Jose was still working for the Navy and seems to have found it difficult to quit that job. In January 1920, Robertson's patience had reached its limit. He issued another warning to Jose, telling him that he would employ someone else to finish the encyclopaedia if Jose did not agree to accept working full-time on the encyclopaedia immediately. Robertson was 'determined to get the Encyclopaedia put through before the end of the year'.[276] Jose finally quit the Navy and started to work full-time on the job. But the relationship between Jose and Robertson was still not smooth. Jose seems to have been overstrained with the workload, especially after the science editor Herbert James Carter left the project in the end of 1921. In May 1922, Jose complained to one of the authors of the encyclopaedia, William Ramsay Smith: 'I have been over-busy these days trying to do five men's work on my own. (The man who was supposed to edit the scientific articles has gone to Europe and left me with a chaos of matter that neeeds (sic!)

[274] Letter from Jose on 23 April 1917 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/41.
[275] Letter from Jose on 12 May 1917 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/41.
[276] Letter from Robertson on 7 January 1920 to Jose, ML: MS 314/41.

scientific knowledge to handle.)'[277] In a letter to Chambers, Jose later described his work conditions as follows:

> *my staff for the two volumes of the Australian book consisted of (a) a Scientific Editor who made an admirable choice of the best scientific writers of articles and then faded out, (b) from 1921 to 1924 one typist, from 1924 to 1926 two typists, (c) in 1923–5 a very careful writer-up of solid articles such as Immigration Restriction, Local Government, etc. All other non-signed articles I had to write myself, and practically every signed article I had to rewrite, except those on the aborigines, birds, and fishes, and that on Economic Geography.*[278]

In 1925 Jose left Angus & Robertson, before the second volume of the *AE* was published. Robertson expressed his anger in a peculiar comparison:

> *When I was a boy I saw a Farce, played by a company of strolling players, in which (I have forgotten all else) a 'gentleman' engaged a nigger to assassinate a hated rival, and agreed to pay him £2 a week for the job. We engaged Jose to edit our Encyclo. at £600 a year, and if I had not butted-in that monumental work would have remained dead for as many years as the hated rival remained alive and kicking!*[279]

Despite their fall-out, Jose later wrote an obituary for Robertson in which he referred to Robertson as a friend and a 'great man', and lamented his loss with sentimental words:

> *We who worked with him, helped him and sometimes fought him, lived in a highly-oxygenated atmosphere which was part of him. Without him – I don't care whether it sounds exaggerated and sentimental; they are no usual faults of mine – the spring has gone out of the year.*[280]

Jose put Robertson's role in the production of the encyclopaedia in a very positive light:

> *Even in the 1920's he read every one of the 3000 columns of the Encyclopaedia, worked through them me with me, insisted, even at the last minute, on alterations he preferred or excellent reasons for not making them.*[281]

Jose's obituary for Robertson and Rebecca Wiley's reminiscences – in which she described the relationship between Jose and Robertson in very positive terms –[282] suggest that Robertson and Jose indeed liked each other and probably also worked together in a productive way. The fact remains that the production of the *AE* was a struggle and

[277] Letter from Jose on 30 May 1922 to William Ramsay Smith, NLA: MS 708.
[278] Letter from Jose on 30 November 1926 to 'the editor' (*Chambers's Encyclopaedia*), NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[279] Letter from Robertson on 3 September 1925 to H.L. White, ML: MS 314/243.
[280] Arthur Wilberforce Jose, 'George Robertson', *The Courier-Mail*, Brisbane, date not legible. (Newspaper article in: Wiley Reminiscences, ML: MS 5238 (p. 360).)
[281] Jose, 'George Robertson' (Wiley Reminiscences, ML: MS 5238 (p. 360).
[282] See for example: Wiley Reminiscences, ML: MS 5238 (p. 355).

sometimes chaotic in the management of the personnel who worked on it. This might have contributed to Robertson's dissatisfaction with some of the articles in the *AE*.[283]

The struggle against time, resulting in financial problems, and the conflicts between Robertson and Jose were matched by the confusion about the conception of the encyclopaedia. It seems that there was no consensus on to what extent *Chambers* should provide a basis for the Australian product. Doubtlessly George Robertson was watching the production of the new *Chambers* attentively. Jose provided him with page-proofs and galley-proofs of the nascent encyclopaedia.[284] The authors of the *AE* knew that the work was to be based upon the Scottish work,[285] but Jose was by no means sure what the exact relationship between the two encyclopaedias was supposed be. In July 1919, he had enquired of Shenstone:

> *One or two things I want to be reminded about. (A) Is the Australian volume to be published separately of or only with the Chambers set? this is important, because the cities, for instance, have been dealt with by Grace Hendy-Pooley only historically, leaving the description of them as they now are to the main Chambers entries. If you want the Australian volume complete in itself, this lack must be supplied.*[286]

It is unsure whether Jose received an answer to this query, but later letters by Jose indicate that he still did not know to what extent the encyclopaedia was to be based on *Chambers*. In 1921, in a letter to the author Baldwin Spencer, he writes vaguely that Angus & Robertson were 'following on the Chambers lines'.[287] The correspondence on the production of the *AE* does not reveal whether Robertson himself was clear about the relationship of the two encyclopaedias. In any case, Jose, who seems to have done the most work on the encyclopaedia, remained in the dark. The main production of the *AE* seems to have gone ahead without clear instructions about its conception.

In 1927, after the publication of the *AE*, William Geddie, one of the editors of *Chambers* had given advice to Angus & Robertson for the preparation of a reprint of volume two of the *AE*.[288] Robertson seems to have been very pleased about this feedback, and, trusting William Geddie, followed his advice about the revision of an article. He told

[283] See: Letter from Robertson on 27 July 1926 to J.F. Bruce, NLA: MS 708.
[284] Letter from Jose on 1 April 1922 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/41.
[285] See for example: Letter from Griffith Taylor on 30 May 1917 to Carter, NLA: MS 708. – Letter from Spencer on 16 August 1918 to Carter, NLA: MS 708.
[286] Letter from Jose on 5 July 1919 to Shenstone, ML: MS 314/41.
[287] Letter from Jose on 25 October 1921 to Baldwin Spencer, NLA: MS 708.
[288] Letter from Robertson on 14 February 1927 to Dr. Anderson, NLA: MS 708.

Geddie that he hoped for 'many more suggestions (...) from you'.[289] It seems that W&R Chambers acted like an older brother or sister giving advice to their little sibling, who gratefully accepted the advice. But the correspondence about the production of the *AE* and the actual results show that there were considerable differences between the two encyclopaedias.

3.2.1 Creating an Encyclopaedia

At least until 1923, Angus & Robertson intended to have their encyclopaedia printed by W&R Chambers.[290] Financial considerations in the end led Angus & Robertson to have the *AE* printed in Australia:

> *Arrangements with regard to the encyclopaedia have been in a state of flux nearly all this year. At first it was intended that Chambers Bros. should print it, as prices here were too high: then a new printer running his machines continuously in three shifts started work an (sic!) pulled down prices, and it was decided to do the printing here.*[291]

The encyclopaedia was thus printed by Eagle Press Ltd, but print and binding were kept 'uniform' with *Chambers*.

The correspondence on the production of the *AE* and on Jose's work for *Chambers*, although not revealing much about *Chambers*, give a brilliant insight into the planning of the *AE*, especially concerning its ordering principle and its function. The disposition of the *AE* does not need any further investigation. As most modern encyclopaedias, the *AE* is alphabetical and was never supposed to be anything else. More interesting is how the producers of the work lemmatised, i.e. broke up the knowledge into entries. In a letter written in 1917, Robertson called the planned encyclopaedia a 'Historical and Biographical Encyclopaedia of Australia'.[292] Was the chosen knowledge thus to be ordered along names and historical events and concepts? As a letter by Jose indicates, the scope of the encyclopaedia was supposed to be much wider. Jose writes that the emerging work was not a '"Who's Who?" but a thing more like the Dictionary of National Biography.'[293] The encyclopaedia was not planned to be a general biographical encyclopaedia; only people who were considered to be important for the Australian nation

[289] Letter from Robertson on 17 February 1927 to William Geddie, NLS: Dep. 341/391. – Letter from Robertson on 14 February 1927 to Anderson, NLA: MS 708. And: Letter from Robertson on 22 August 1927 to Geddie, NLS: Dep. 341/391.
[290] See: Letter from Angus & Robertson on 11 September 1923 to Sidney Herbert Ray, NLA: MS 708.
[291] Letter from Angus & Robertson on 24 December 1924 to Ray, NLA: MS 708.
[292] Letter from Robertson on 1 June 1917 to Henry George, NLA: MS 708.
[293] Letter from Jose on 2 August 1920 to Charles Edwin Woodrow Bean, NAA: AWM 38, 3.

were to be included. Jose's characterisation of the *AE* also suggests that the encyclopaedia was intended to be more than a collection of biographies of people. It was going to be a biography of the Australian nation. The choice of knowledge and its lemmatisation were to be based on this criterion of national importance.

This interpretation of Jose's letter to Bean is confirmed through other sources, first and foremost through the taxonomies held at the Australian War Memorial. There are two slightly different versions of a taxonomy dealing with scientific sections, and another one dealing with 'Social and Economic Science'.[294] Some comments in letters from Carter indicate that he was the author of those taxonomies and that they were not meant to be complete, but were rather work in progress.[295] These taxonomies give a rare insight into how knowledge is lemmatised in an encyclopaedic work. The taxonomies confirm that the *AE* was to be organised according to national criteria. The taxonomy on scientific topics contains three columns. In the first, the knowledge is divided into subjects and sub-subjects; in the second, the space allotted to these subjects is listed; and in the third, the authors dealing with the subjects are named.[296] The subjects that were allotted the most space were Zoology, Botany and Geology. It was planned that zoology would take up 94 columns, Botany 70 and Geology 56.[297]

Zoology

The zoology section includes the following subjects:

(a) Prot-Coel-Plat-Nem-Rot	*4–5*
(b) Por-Echin-Crust-Moll:	*8*
(c) Annulates & Peripatus	*2*
(d) <u>INSECTA</u>	
1. Lepidoptera	*1–5*
2. Coleoptera	*2–3*
3. Other Orders	*5–6*
4. Economic Entoml.	*4–5*
(e) Spiders & Scorpions	*2*
(f) Fishes	*12*

[294] Taxonomies over the science sections: NAA: AWM 39, 3 and 4. – Taxonomy over the sections on social and economic science: NAA: AWM 39, 3.
[295] See: Letter from Carter on 11 June 1917 to Jose, NAA: AWM 39, 3. And: Letter from Carter on 20 June 1917 to Jose, NAA: AWM 39, 3.
[296] This refers to the taxonomy contained in: NAA: AWM 39, 4.
[297] The list does not give any measuring units, but it is most likely that the numbers referred to columns.

(g) Amphibians & Reptiles	*12*
(h) Ceratodus	*1*
(i) Birds	*15*
(j) Mammals	*20*
(k) Zoological Gardens	*2*
(l) Museums[298]	

A few points are striking about this list. (1) The classes of the fish, amphibians and reptiles, birds and mammals that make up the subphylum of the vertebrates – or the sub-kingdom, as they would have been called at the time –[299] are allotted more than half of the space that was allocated to animals. All of these classes are mentioned separately. (2) Apart from mammals, insects are the class that get the largest space allocated. (3) The ceratodus, a type of fish, receives its own space. (4) Two sub-categories, Zoological Gardens and Museums, do not fit the established pattern of the list.[300]

The reason why the vertebrates are allocated so much space and why all classes of vertebrates get mentioned separately intuitively makes sense. The general reader would surely have been most interested in 'big animals', that is vertebrates. These are the animals a general audience would have been most familiar with. Furthermore, vertebrates are the 'predominant subphylum of the phylum Chordata'[301] which contains 48,000 species, more than any other phylum apart from the Arthropoda and the Mollusca.[302] The dominance of insects can be explained similarly. Insects are 'the largest class of the phylum Athropoda'[303] and this in turn is the phylum with the most species, more than one

[298] Subject list, NAA: AWM 39, 4.
[299] Richard Lydekker et al., *The Concise Knowledge: Natural History* (Hutchinson, London 1897) p. ix.
[300] For the categories of the Kingdom Animalia see: Eldra Solomon et al., *Biology* (Brooks/Cole, South Melbourne 2002) p. 11 and appendix C, A-8-9. The animals (Kingdom Animalia) are divided into different categories, starting with the so-called Phylum. Phyla are then divided into Subphyla. From there the order is Class, Order, Family and Genus (with specific epithet).
[301] 'Vertebrate', *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-9110433, accessed 3 March 06.
[302] Solomon et al., *Biology*, Appendix C. A-9. – Around the time of the publication of the *AE*, the Arthropoda and the Mollusca would have been on a different level of the classification system. They would have been called sub-kingdoms (equivalent to subphylums in the later system) rather than phyla. According to Lydekker et alt., the animal kingdom was directly split into sub-kingdoms without another classification in between. The fact remains that the vertebrates are and were a very large sub-kingdom (respectively subphylum). And as Lydekker mentions, the vertebrates are considered to be the highest of all animals, which gives an additional explanation for the dominance of vertebrates in the list. (Lydekker, *Natural History*, pp. ix–xvi.)
[303] 'Insect', *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-9105953, accessed 3 March 06.

million.[304] At the end of the nineteenth century, Richard Lydekker et al. had written in their *Concise Knowledge*:

> *Insects are by far the most numerous class of animals which inhabit the globe at the present time. The actual number of species on our lists cannot be much less than 300,000; and many thousands of new species are described every year.*[305]

Point one and two of the above are thus not surprising.

That a type of fish is given its own space is more in need of explanation. The Ceratodus (or Neoceratodus Forsteri), the Australian Lungfish, is the only living species of the family Ceratidae of the suborder Monopneuma of the order Sirenoidei of the subclass Dipnoi of the class fish of the subphylum Vertebrate of the Phylum Chordata.[306] This definition, deliberately kept in the complicated jargon of the biological scientist, makes evident that a very specific individual animal was attributed a separate space in the planning of the *AE*. There is no plausible scientific reason for why the knowledge piece 'Ceratodus' was broken off from larger pieces of knowledge, such as 'Fishes'. Walter Baldwin Spencer, who wrote the entry 'Ceratodus', felt he needed to thank Carter to allow him so much space for his article.[307]

The type of ceratodus found in Australia is unique. Unlike the African and South American version of the lungfish, the Australian Ceratodus can live both on land and under water. Just like the platypus, the Ceratodus was suspected by nineteenth century scientists to be a 'missing link' in the story of the Darwinian evolution.[308] Baldwin Spencer seemed to believe that the African and South American version of the lungfish were extinct, as the following quote from the *AE* demonstrates: 'It (the Ceratodus, N.K.) survived in Africa and South America until Cretaceous times; then it apparently died out everywhere except in Australia'.[309] Thus the lungfish was considered an Australian speciality and therefore fitted into a biography of the Australian nation.[310]

---

[304] Solomon et al., *Biology*, Appendix C, A-8.
[305] Lydekker et al., *Natural History*, p. 551.
[306] 'Lungfish', *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-9111053, accessed 1 March 06.
[307] Letter from Spencer on 23 January 1919 to Carter, ML: ZML A7273.
[308] Libby Robin, *How a Continent Created a Nation* (University of New South Wales, Sydney 2007) p. 45.
[309] Walter Baldwin Spencer, 'Ceratodus', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 248–249.
[310] For the Australian Lungfish and its place in the Australian imagination see also: Robin, *How a Continent*, pp. 38–55.

What about the 'Zoological Gardens' and 'Museums'? Neither of these fit into a zoological classification of the animal kingdom. Just like encyclopaedias, museums are an ordered exhibition of knowledge.[311] Whereas encyclopaedias present knowledge in the form of texts, museums display knowledge through the exhibition of artefacts, often supplemented by text. Both encyclopaedias and museums put the chosen knowledge in a particular order, encyclopaedias by disposing and lemmatising the chosen knowledge, and museums by arranging the displayed artefacts in a particular way. They represent a specific outlook on the world. Museums, like encyclopaedias, have an air of objectivity. The exhibited objects in a museum and the texts to go with them are carefully chosen to fulfil a certain goal, but this might not always be apparent to the visitors of a museum. Objects are usually not seen as subjective. The interplay between these two factors – an air of objectivity in connection with the fact that museums order knowledge – gives museums considerable political power. Benedict Anderson has pinpointed what powerful instruments museums are in the creation of new nations, especially in a colonial context.[312] The creators of a museum implicitly, and in some cases explicitly, claim: this is our history, culture, environment etc. A suitable past, vital for the process of nation building, can conveniently be acquired through the creation of a museum. By these means, someone else's history, traditions, culture or natural environment may be appropriated. Museums are thus important factors in the building of a new nation. That the producers of the *AE* planned a separate entry (or maybe several entries) devoted to museums indicates once more that the *AE* was planned as a national enterprise.[313]

The other subject not fitting the superficial scientific outlay of the encyclopaedia, 'Zoological Gardens', follows the same logic as 'Museums'. Zoological Gardens are in essence museums with life objects. They exhibit the natural environment of a region, country or the whole world. Countries or cities often take great pride in their zoological gardens. In Australia's case, this pride was considerably augmented through its possession of a unique, abundant and diverse wildlife, very different from the wildlife in the Old World. Zoological gardens just like museums support the nation-building process, and therefore are a logical entry for an encyclopaedia portraying a nation. It is unclear whether the producers of the *AE* were fully aware of the significance of museums and

[311] See also: Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 7.
[312] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, pp. 178–185.
[313] In the other version of the taxonomy of scientific subjects, 'Museums' is missing. (See: NAA: AWM 39, 3.) However, the actual result in the *AE* confirms the taxonomy quoted above since the encyclopaedia does contain an article 'Museum'.

zoological gardens for nation building processes. But Robertson and his editors must have felt to a certain degree that museums and zoological gardens belonged to a portrait of a nation.

Botany

The division of the topic 'Botany' shows similar traits as the division of 'Zoology':

(a) Algae, Charac & Aquatic Phanerog.	4
(b) Lichens, Fungi, & Myrm.	4
(c) Ferns, Mosses & Hepat	10
(d) Phanerogams	50
(e) Economic Bot:	2
(f) Botanic Gardens	[no number given, N.K.][314]

This is the wrong place, and a historian the wrong person, to deal with botanical details. But a comparison of this list on a superficial level with a current biology book makes clear that the list included all the large phyla of the Kingdom Plantae: the Bryophyta (mosses), the Hepatophyta (liverworts), the Pterophyta (ferns) and the Anthophyta (flowering plants or phanerogams).[315] In addition, the list contained algae and fungi that in modern biology are not classified as plants, belonging to different kingdoms. This difference is explained by the advancement of the biological science in the many decades after the production of the encyclopaedia. There is also nothing unusual about attributing phanerogams a much larger space than the other categories. The Anthophyta are by far the biggest phylum of the Kingdom Plantae.

As in the classification of zoology, two categories stand out: 'Economic Botany' and 'Botanic Gardens'. Botanic gardens are comparable to zoos and museums. They display knowledge by ordering a certain type of materia. Like zoos, botanic gardens would have taught Australians about their environment, still new to many people, and might have instilled a sense of pride in the diversity of the Australian nature. 'Botanic Gardens' was another piece of puzzle in the biography of the Australian nation. The case

[314] Subject list, NAA: AWM 39, 4.
[315] Solomon et al., *Biology*, Appendix C, A-7-8.

of 'Economic Botany' – in a modern definition the discipline that 'deals with plants of practical use to man'[316] – is less apparent. It is enough to see though that 'Economic Botany' does not contradict but rather supports a national order. In a national biography, knowledge about how to take advantage of the natural environment may be useful.

Geology

The topic 'Geology' lists the following:

(a) General	25
(b) Palaeontology	4–5
(c) Mineralogy	2
(d) Mining	21–22
(e) Artesian Bores	2
(f) Limestone Caves	1[317]

Today, geology is usually split into a whole range of different sub-disciplines.[318] In the 1920s, geology was divided into three main sub-disciplines: 1) Dynamical Geology: 'a consideration of the facts and principles concerning the various dynamical agents, such as wind, running water, moving ice, volcanic activities, etc., which operate upon the earth, and modify its outer portion.' 2) Structural Geology: 'an account of the nature, properties, relations and positions of the component rock masses of the outer part of the earth. It includes the architecture of the outer shell of the earth.' 3) Historical Geology: 'a review of the sequence of the events which have happened to the earth in the past, as revealed by the rocks and fossils.' The first two of these disciplines were subsumed into physical geology. Within historical geology one differentiated between paleogeography and palaeontology.[319] The producers of the *AE* planned to spend a bit less than half of the space devoted to geology to a general article on geology (44.6%); a bit more than a third to an economical aspect of geology (mining, 38.4%); and the remaining space to a sub-discipline of historical geology (palaeontology, 8%), to a sub-discipline of structural geology (mineralogy, 3.6%) and to two aspects of the sub-discipline of dynamical geology (Artesian Bores, 3.6%, and Limestone Caves, 1.8%). Three points catch the eye

[316] 'Botany', *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-48780, accessed 7 March 06.
[317] Subject list, NAA: AWM 39, 4.
[318] See for example 'Geology', *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-9036467, accessed 1 March 06.
[319] Louis V. Pirsson and Charles Schuchert, *Introductory Geology* (Wiley, New York and London 1924) pp. 4–5.

of the observer. (1) Why was there no space planned for the other sub-discipline of historical geology, paleogeography? (2) Why was there such a disproportionately large space set aside for mining?[320] (3) Why were Artesian bores and limestone given so much importance that they were mentioned separately?[321]

About the first of these three questions one can only speculate. Paleogeography, according to a textbook of geology of 1924, is about 'the varied dispositions of land and sea and their character in former ages'.[322] So why was palaeontology, 'picturing the different successions of organic life which have inhabited the earth',[323] preferred over palaeogeography? As a layperson one can only speculate that the producers of the encyclopaedia may have thought that the general user of their work would be more interested in the history of the organic life of their nation than in the history of the land and sea.

Why did the producers of the encyclopaedia plan to devote so much space to the subject of mining? The history of Australian mining sheds light on this question. Mining has a long tradition in Australia, reaching back to times long before white occupation, mining being practised in Australia for at least 20,000 years. A particular type of mining, gold mining, played an important role in the development of the Australian nation:

> *The goldfields were the migrant reception centres of the nineteenth century, the crucibles of nationalism and xenophobia, the nurseries of artists, singers and writers as well as mining engineers and business magnates. The country's great national union of bush workers had its origins on the Victorian goldfields.*[324]

This background explains why mining was attributed such a disproportionate space within geology. An industry with such a long history and a strong influence on the daily life of people has to be treated extensively in a biography of a nation. That mining played a role for the development of the Australian nation strengthened this need.

The reason why Artesian bores and limestone caves were given so much space points in the same direction. An Artesian bore or Artesian well is 'a man-made spring

[320] In the other scientific taxonomy, the space devoted to mining is a bit less (15-20 columns). However this space is still disproportionately large. (See: NAA: AWM 39, 3.)
[321] In the other scientific taxonomy, the limestone caves are missing. However, the actual result in the *AE* confirms the taxonomy quoted above. The encyclopaedia does contain an article 'Limestone Caves'.
[322] Pirsson and Schuchert, *Introductory Geology*, p. 5.
[323] Ibid.
[324] Macintyre, *A Concise History*, p. 90.

from which water flows under neutral pressure without pumping',[325] and Australia has one of the largest areas of Artesian waters in the world, the Great Artesian Basin.[326] Limestone caves as such are nothing rare: 'The largest and most common caves are those formed by chemical reaction between circulating groundwater and bedrock composed of limestone or dolomite'.[327] The article on limestone caves in the *AE*, written by Oliver Trickett of the Mining Museum (NSW Department of Mines), makes clear why limestone caves were given a separate entry in the work: 'Australian [limestone, N.K.] caves are remarkable for their number, extent and beauty.'[328] Both Artesian bores and limestone caves were looked at as specialties of the Australian continent: Artesian bores because Australia had one of the largest in the world, and limestone caves because of their claimed great number, extent and beauty. Limestone caves and Artesian bores were two further pieces in the puzzle of the Australian nation.

The taxonomy of the planned science articles in the *AE* thus confirms the *AE's* national orientation. Comments by Jose complete this picture. In 1923, Jose told World War One historian C.E.W. Bean, whom he asked for help concerning the article on aviation: 'We are concerned, of course, only with Australian aviation.'[329] The Australian nation was the criterion also for the content of the encyclopaedia. The national orientation is reflected in Jose's attitude towards the authors of the encyclopaedia. In a letter to the author Sir Archibald Strong, Jose reminds the addressee why the payment for the authors was so meagre:

> *The idea is, I believe, that this is more or less of a national work and authors may be proud of having their names in it. I can guarantee that the publishers will make no profit out of it – and wouldn't even if they got all the matter gratis.*[330]

The authors of the *AE* seem to have been very aware that the work was supposed to concentrate on matters relevant for the Australian nation. Bronislaw Malinowski wrote: 'I am looking forward to the publication of the Encyclopaedia, which I am sure will be of

[325] 'Artesian Well', *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-9009688, accessed 8 March 06.
[326] 'Great Artesian Basin', *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Online, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-9037827, accessed 8 March 06.
[327] 'Cave', *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-9111019, accessed 8 March 06.
[328] Oliver Trickett, 'Limestone Caves', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 740.
[329] Letter from Jose on 13 November 1923 to Bean, NAA: AWM 38, 3.
[330] Letter from Jose on 25 May 1921 to Archibald Strong, NLA: MS 708.

great interest to all Australophils.'[331] Robin John Tillyard, who wrote the article 'Insects', was very keen to keep up the Australian focus himself:

> *The Insects to be figured should be, as far as possible, of groups peculiar to Australia, so as to exhibit the characteristic fauna, & and not merely showy exogenic or immigrant forms, like the Ornithoptera butterflies for instance.*[332]

Tillyard wanted Australian insects to illustrate his article. He criticised the author of another article for not being enough Australia-oriented. About the article on ants, Tillyard complained to Jose:

> *Thanks for your letter of 11th ult., and also for the copies of the articles on the Lepidoptera, Butterflies and Ants. I think the last is rendered very unbalanced by Mr Lea's long quoted account (from Dodd) of the habits of the Green Leaf-dwelling Ant, but that is his affair, not mine. This ant in not typically Australian, and it would have been better to give fuller details, if they are necessary, of the Bull-dogs and other typical Australian ants.*[333]

The outcome of this matter was that, in the end, Tillyard wrote the article himself.

Focusing on Australia could also mean that the authors had to write something entirely new, as William Ramsay Smith wrote:

> *This is the first occasion on which I have given 'to the world' anything like a complete account of an evolution in a department of Sanitation that is essentially Australian and that is being adopted in all parts of the world.*[334]

What were the sources Ramsay Smith used? Could he not rely on research that had been done on sanitation before? And what were the sources used for the *AE* in general? This question is important. If the authors of the encyclopaedia mainly used British sources, the argument that the *AE* was a genuine Australian national work would be challenged. A national order alone is not enough to create a national work. The use of Australian sources for the production of the *AE* would strongly support the argument that the *AE* represented a serious attempt at producing something genuinely Australian.

Caroline Jones, in her PhD thesis on George Robertson, makes a claim about the sources used for the encyclopaedia, that needs some further consideration. Jones holds that the *AE* was part of a national narrative, but she also maintains that 'general knowledge of the outer world came to Australian households through Scottish eyes.'[335]

---

[331] Letter from Bronislaw Malinowski on 21 July 1919 to Carter, NLA: MS 708.
[332] Letter from Robin John Tillyard on 10 August 1917 to Carter, NLA: MS 708.
[333] Letter from Tillyard on 5 June 1922 to Jose, NLA: MS 708.
[334] Letter from William Ramsay Smith on 13 September 1926 to 'the editor' (*AE*), NLA: MS 708.
[335] Jones, *Australian Imprint*, p. 305.

Jones bases her claim mainly on two arguments. She writes that 'most readers bought the Australian volumes alongside the Scottish ones because that was the cheaper option', and she asserts that

> *even material within the Australian encyclopaedia was Scots-flavoured. Many of the subjects written about in the biographical sketches were born in Scotland and entries on land settlement and dairying, for example, used the report from the Scottish Agricultural Commission of 1911 as the basis for their research.*[336]

Jones' argument that Australians bought the *AE* with *Chambers* because it was a cheaper option has a fundamental flaw. It is likely that customers who bought *Chambers* might have been interested in acquiring the work in package with the Australian work since the *AE* only consisted of two volumes. But would this marketing strategy really have worked the other way round too? Would people who had decided to buy the *AE* have purchased the ten volumes of *Chambers* just to get the *AE* slightly cheaper?[337] This is highly doubtful. A random pick of 200 biographical articles included in the *AE* shows that Jones' argument about an overrepresentation of Scottish-born people is unsustainable too. Of 200 people, 87 were born in England, 43 in Australia, 28 in Scotland, 25 in Ireland and one in Wales. The remaining people were born in the Bermudas, Chile, Denmark, Germany, India (2), Malta, Polish Prussia, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tahiti, the Ukraine and the United States of America.[338] Thus the Scottish

---

[336] Ibid.

[337] Rebecca Wiley recalled that the *AE* was offered with 'a slight reduction in price'. Wiley Reminiscences, ML: MS 5238 (p. 354).

[338] Edward Abbott, England (*AE*, vol. 1, p. 1); Francis William Lauderdale Adams, Malta (vol. 1, pp. 38–39); Sir James Wilson Agnew, Ireland (vol. 1, p. 40); George Allen, England (vol. 1, pp. 51–52); Joseph Anderson, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 57); George French Angas, England (vol. 1, p. 58); Thomas Archer, Scotland (vol. 1, pp. 70–71); Jules Francois Archibald, Australia (vol. 1, p. 71); Julian Rossi Ashton, England (vol. 1, p. 83); Sir Henry Ayers, England (vol. 1, p. 115); Henry Backhaus, Germany (vol. 1, p. 116); Charles Badham, England, (vol. 1, p. 119); Frederick Manson Bailey, England (vol. 1, p. 120); Henry Ebenezer Barff, Tahiti (vol. 1, p. 133); George Barrington, Ireland (vol. 1, p. 139); George Bass, England (vol. 1, pp. 142–143); John Batman, Australia (vol. 1, p. 145); Alexander Berry, Scotland (vol. 1, pp. 158–159); Samuel Wensley Blackall, Ireland (vol. 1, p. 169); Benjamin Boothby, England (vol. 1, p. 181); Sir James Penn Boucaut, England (vol. 1, pp. 189–190); Sir William Henry Bragg, England (vol. 1, pp. 199–200); Charles Henry Bromby, England (vol. 1, pp. 207–208); Francis Cadell, Scotland (vol. 1, pp. 228–229); Robert Campbell, Scotland (vol. 1, pp. 232–233); Baron Carmichael, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 238); Martin Cash, Ireland (vol. 1, pp. 239–240); John Henry Challis, England (vol. 1, p. 251); Charles Haddon Chambers, Australia (vol. 1, pp. 251–252); Sir Herbert Charles Chermside, England (vol. 1, p. 254); Hugh Culling Eardley Childers, England (vol. 1, p. 254); Charles Clark, England (vol. 1, p. 270); Sir John Alexander Cockburn, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 279); Sir Jenkin Coles, Australia (vol. 1, p. 281); Sir John Colton, England (vol. 1, pp. 285–286); James Cook, England (vol. 1, pp. 304–309); Sir Charles Cowper, England (vol. 1, pp. 319–320); William Cowper, England (vol. 1, p. 320); Henry Daglish, Australia (vol. 1, p. 351); Alexander Dalrymple, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 355); Peter Dillon, Ireland (vol. 1, pp. 371–372); James George Drake, England (vol. 1, p. 380); Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, Ireland (vol. 1, p. 388); John Saumarez Dumaresq, Australia (vol. 1, p. 390); Sir Thomas Elder, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 404); Robert Lewis John Ellery, England (vol. 1, pp. 404–405); George Essex Evans, England (vol. 1, pp. 414–415); Sir Thomas Thomson Ewing, Australia (vol. 1, p. 416); Edward John Eyre, England (vol. 1, pp. 440–441); Peter Faucett, Ireland (vol. 1,

p. 443); Alfred Felton, England (vol. 1, pp. 452–453); Sir James Ferguson, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 453); Barron Field, England (vol. 1, p. 458); Henry Finn, England (vol. 1, p. 460); Andrew Fisher, Scotland (vol. 1, pp. 463–464); John Foster Vesey Fitzgerald, Ireland (vol. 1, p. 467); Matthew Flinders, England (vol. 1, pp. 472–474); Sir Francis Forbes, Bermudas (vol. 1, p. 480); Sir George Arthur French, Ireland (vol. 1, p. 490); Sir Philip Oakley Fysh, England (vol. 1, pp. 496–497); Sir Robert Randolph Garran, Australia (vol. 1, p. 499); William Robert Giblin, Australia (vol. 1, p. 550); Matthew Gibney, Ireland (vol. 1, pp. 550–551); William Ernest Powell Giles, England (vol. 1, p. 551); Patrick McMahon Glynn, Ireland (vol. 1, p. 555); Richard Goldsbrough, England (vol. 1, p. 561); George Woodroffe Goyder, England (vol. 1, p. 574); Sir George Grey, Portugal (vol. 1, pp. 582–584); Henri Grien, Switzerland (vol. 1, pp. 584–585); Ronald Campbell Gunn, South Africa (vol. 1, p. 589); Sir John Winthorp Hackett, Ireland (vol. 1, p. 591); Sir Richard Davies Hanson, England (vol. 1, pp. 594–595); Charles Harpur, Australia (vol. 1, p. 600); Sir John Hayes, England (vol. 1, pp. 606–607); Sir Edmund Yeamans Walcott Henderson, England (vol. 1, p. 609); Sir Robert George Wyndham Herbert, England (vol. 1, pp. 610–611); William Austin Horn, Australia (vol. 1, p. 622); Alexander Hamilton Hume, Australia (vol. 1, p. 634); Frederick Maitland Innes, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 666); Sir Joseph George Long Innes, Australia (vol. 1, p. 666); Sir William Hill Irvine, Ireland (vol. 1, pp. 676–677); Isaac Alfred Isaacs, Australia (vol. 1, p. 677); Robert Logan Jack, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 679); Sir Walter Hartwell James, Australia (vol. 1, p. 680); Sir Patrick Alfred Jennings, Ireland (vol. 1, p. 681); Jorgen Jorgensen, Denmark (vol. 1, pp. 687–688); Edward Kelly, Australia (vol. 1, pp. 692–693); William Kidstone, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 697); William Francis King, England (vol. 1, p. 700); Henry Kingsley, England (vol. 1, p. 701); Francis Peter Labillière, Australia (vol. 1, p. 706); William Lane, England (vol. 1, pp. 716–717); Walter Lawry, England (vol. 1, p. 726); William Lawson, England (vol. 1, p. 727); Sir Neil Elliot Lewis, Australia (vol. 1, p. 734); Sir Charles Lilley, England (vol. 1, p. 740); William Lithgow, Scotland (vol. 1, p. 746); Edmund Lockyer, England (vol. 1, p. 758); William Longbottom, England (vol. 1, p. 760); Alfred James Peter Lutwyche, England (vol. 1, p. 766); Sir William John Lyne, Australia (vol. 1, pp. 767–768); George Fairfowl Macarthur, Australia (vol. 2, p. 1); John McEncroe, Ireland (vol. 2, pp. 7–8); John MacGillivray, Scotland (vol. 2, p. 8); Francis Mahony, Australia (vol. 2, p. 20); Joseph Henry Maiden, England (vol. 2, p. 20); Sir William Montagu Manning, England (vol. 2, p. 32); Samuel Marsden, England (vol. 2, pp. 41–42); James Meehan, Ireland (vol. 2, p. 48); Dame Nellie Melba, Australia (vol. 2, pp. 52–53); David Max Meldrum, Scotland (vol. 2, p. 57); James Lionel Michael, England (vol. 2, p. 71); Nikolai Nicolaevitch Mikluho-Maklay, Ukraine (vol. 2, p. 82); Sir Denison Samuel King Miller, Australia (vol. 2, p. 89); David Scott Mitchell, Australia (vol. 2, p. 126); Sir Robert Molesworth, Ireland (vol. 2, p. 131); Sir John Monash, Australia (vol. 2, p.137); Maggie More, USA (vol. 2, p. 140); Isaac Nathan, England (vol. 2, p. 174); Sir Hugh Muir Nelson, Scotland (vol. 2, pp. 187–188); George Robert Nichols, Australia (vol. 2, p. 205); Sir Henry Wylie Norman, England (vol. 2, p. 211); George Augustus Constantine Phipps Marquess of Normanby, England (vol. 2, p. 211); Rebecca Oakes, Australia (vol. 2, p. 223); Sir Maurice Charles Philip O'Connell, Ireland (vol. 2, p. 224); Sir Harry St. George Ord, England (vol. 2, p. 236); Arthur Orton, England (vol. 2, pp. 237–238); John Oxley, England (vol. 2, p. 241); Sir Arthur Hunter Palmer, Ireland (vol. 2, p. 250); Sir James Frederick Palmer, England (vol. 2, p. 250); Thomas Pamphlett, England (vol. 2, pp. 252–253); Sir William Edward Parry, England (vol. 2, p. 271); Andrew Barton Paterson, Australia (vol. 2, p. 278); John Gibson Paton, Scotland (vol. 2, pp. 279–280); Sir Samuel Augustus Pethebridge, Australia (vol. 2, p. 289); Arthur Phillip, England (vol. 2, pp. 295–297); Sir Robert Philp, Scotland (vol. 2, p. 297); John Piper, Scotland (vol. 2, p. 301); Sir Frederick William Pottinger, India (vol. 2, pp. 323–324); Rosa Caroline Praed, Australia (vol. 2, p. 324); Charles Price, England (vol. 2, p. 332); Francis Drinkall Pritt, England (vol. 2, p. 337); Sir John Quick, England (vol. 2, p. 354); James Quinn, Ireland (vol. 2, p. 354); Edward Pierson Ramsay, Australia (vol. 2, p. 374); Sir Harry Holdsworth Rawson, England (vol. 2, p. 375); Edward Henry Rennie, Australia (vol. 2, p. 379); John Ridley, England (vol. 2, p. 386); William Ridley, England (vol. 2, pp. 386–387); Walter Rosenhain, Australia (vol. 2, p. 399); Sir Charles Rosenthal, Australia (vol. 2, pp. 399–400); Sir Granville de Laune Ryrie, Australia (vol. 2, pp. 411–412); William Schofield, England (vol. 2, p. 423); Walter Scott, England (vol. 2, p. 431); Dom Joseph Maria Benedict Serra, Spain (vol. 2, p. 444); James Service, Scotland (vol. 2, pp. 444–445); Lawrence Bonaventura Sheil, Ireland (vol. 2, p. 454); Lord Sherbrooke, England (vol. 2, pp. 454–455); Ewen George Sinclair-Maclagan, Scotland (vol. 2, p. 465); Sir Charles Sladen, England (vol. 2, p. 467); Kenneth Snodgrass, Scotland (vol. 2, p. 475); Daniel Carl Solander, Sweden (vol. 2, p. 479); Catherine Helen Spence, Scotland (vol. 2, pp. 488–489); Sir Walter Baldwin Spencer, England (vol. 2, p. 489); Thomas Steel, Scotland (vol. 2, p. 496); Sir Edward Charles Stirling, Australia (vol. 2, p. 499); Thomas Quinton Stow, England (vol. 2, p. 501); Sir Paul Edmund de Strzelecki, Polish Prussia (vol. 2, pp. 508–509); Sir Alexander Stuart, Scotland (vol. 2, p. 509); Charles Sturt, India (vol. 2, p. 510); David Syme, Scotland (vol. 2, p. 528); Ralph Tate, England (vol. 2, p. 541); John Tawell, England (vol. 2, pp. 541–542); Watkin Tench, Wales (vol. 2, pp. 545–546); John Joseph Therry, Ireland (vol. 2, p. 548); Sir Roger Therry,

took up 14% of the biographical articles in the *AE*. This cannot be called an overrepresentation. The state with the largest number of Scots, New South Wales, was home to a much higher percentage of Scots, 34% in 1911.[339] As Ian H. Burnley stated, in the nineteenth century, 'the Scottish settlers made a disproportionate contribution to political, legal, educational, scientific and medical élites'.[340]

So what about Jones's claim that a Scottish source was the basis for some of the entries in the *AE*? Jones asserts that entries on land settlement and dairying used the report from the Scottish Agricultural Commission of 1911 as a basis. However, she does not give any evidence for this claim. There is no article 'Land Settlement' contained in the encyclopaedia, and the articles 'Land Legislation' and 'Agriculture' contain no references to a Scottish report. The article 'Dairying' does have a reference to a Scottish source. The author of the article, Walter Scott Campbell writes:

> *Most of the observations and conclusions embodied in the report of the Scottish agricultural commission (published in Edinburgh in 1911 under the title* Australia: its Land, Conditions and Prospects*) hold good for the present time, and constitute an excellent study of dairying conditions in the Commonwealth. But legislation passed by the Commonwealth parliament in 1924 creates new supervising authorities which are intended to standardize production in all the States.*[341]

This quote might indicate that Campbell had used the report of the Scottish Agricultural Commission, but it does not prove that the report was Scots-flavoured. Jones' claim about the use of Scottish sources is not confirmed by the evidence. The correspondence on the production of the *AE* shows a contrasting picture; there is ample evidence of sources other than Scottish.

Ireland (vol. 2, pp. 548–549); William Kyffin Thomas, England (vol. 2, pp. 550–551); Charles Throsby, England (vol. 2, p. 553); Edwin Tivey, Australia (vol. 2, p. 563); Sir Charles Todd, England (vol. 2, p. 565); Robert Towns, England (vol. 2, pp. 571–572); William Arthur Trenwith, Australia (vol. 2, p. 592); George Henry Stephen Trott, Australia (vol. 2, p. 596); Sir George Tryon, England (vol. 2, p. 598); William Bernard Ullathorne, England, (vol. 2, pp. 603–604); Roger William Bede Vaughan, England (vol. 2, pp. 610–611); Sir George Frederick Verdon, England (vol. 2, p. 617); Sir Charles Gregory Wade, Australia (vol. 2, p. 628); Sir Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, England (vol. 2, p. 630); James Backhouse Walker, Australia (vol. 2, p. 632); George Marsden Waterhouse, England (vol. 2, p. 637); John Watsford, Australia (vol. 2, p. 643); John Christian Watson, Chile (vol. 2, p. 643); John West, England (vol. 2, p. 653); William Pritchard Weston, England (vol. 2, p. 658); Sir Cyril Brudenell Bingham White, Australia (vol. 2, pp. 664–665); Walter Withers, England (vol. 2, p. 674); Sir Henry Thomas Wrenfordsley, Ireland (vol. 2, p. 736); Sir George Young, England, (vol. 2, p. 741).

[339] Ian H. Burnley, *The Impact of Immigration on Australia: A Demographic Approach* (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 2001) p. 57.

[340] Burnley, *The Impact*, p. 64.

[341] Walter Scott Campbell, 'Dairying', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 351.

Many articles were based on older works of the authors. Tannatt William Edgeworth David used a revised version of his article *The Geology of the Commonwealth*, earlier published in the *Handbook of Australia*, a government publication of 1914, for his article 'Geology', written in cooperation with Leo A. Cotton.[342] William Ramsay Smith reworked his article on Aborigines that he had written for the *Official Yearbook of the Commonwealth of Australia*,[343] Baldwin Spencer recycled an *Encyclopaedia Britannica* article for his part of the article on Aborigines in the *AE*.[344] Griffith Taylor used work he had done for the *Oxford Survey of the Empire*.[345] Ramsay Smith's example points to another important source the producers of the *AE* relied upon: the Australian government. The *Official Yearbook of the Commonwealth of Australia* was written under instructions from the Minister of State and for Home and Territories. The producers of the *AE* had often asked for help from the Australian government and seem to have received a large amount of information they considered useful. In 1924, Jose wrote to the Secretary for Home and Territories, stating that 'we have received so much help from Federal Departments hitherto' and asking for further help.[346] The state governments seem to have provided information for the *AE* as well. Author Thomas George Tucker informed Jose that 'the Directors of Education (except W.A.) have supplied me with full & definite answers to all my questions'.[347] There is no indication that the Australian government had taken an initiative on its own to influence the content and outlay of the *AE*.

Written and oral primary sources of various kinds were another source for the *AE*. Rebecca Wiley recalls that

> *the contributors consisted of professors & others in the world of science, medicine, theology, psychology, biology, zoology & veterinary; also anyone any where (sic!) in Aus, who were (sic!) likely to have any old Australiana history; or likely to have in some pioneer families data for short biographies of past or present great men or women, in literature, art, politics, drama, music or any other profession. Many of the known living ones G.R. communicated with personally.*[348]

Because of Wiley's wish to cast a positive light on her former employer, one has to take her praise of George Robertson and his various enterprises with a pinch of salt. In the

[342] Letter from Tannatt William Edgeworth David on 17 January 1922 to Carter, NLA: MS 708.
[343] Letter from Ramsay Smith on 22 October 1921 to Jose, NLA: MS 708.
[344] Letter from Jose on 22 September 1921 to Baldwin Spencer, NLA: MS 708.
[345] Letter from Thomas Griffith Taylor on 30 May 1917 to Carter, NLA: MS 708.
[346] Letter from Jose on 8 August 1924 to the Secretary for Home and Territories, NAA: A1, 1924/21464.
[347] Letter from Thomas George Tucker on 17 April 1924 to Jose, ML: ZML A7273.
[348] Wiley Reminiscences, ML: MS 5238 (p. 350).

words quoted, Wiley seems to have tried to give Robertson and the encyclopaedia as much credibility as possible, writing that Robertson kept personal contact with people portrayed in the encyclopaedia. But Wiley's claim that oral sources were consulted for the production of the encyclopaedia is confirmed by Jose's correspondence. He was in touch with the son of Edmund Lockyer who received an entry in the *AE*, and clearly Lockyer provided Jose with biographical information about his father.[349]

In addition to personal testimonies, older works of the authors and the information provided by the Australian government, various other sources were consulted for the *AE*, such as the *Historical Records of Australia*, the Bureau of Statistics, the official pilot directory, memorials and monographs by other authors, and private Australiana collections.[350] There is no indication in the correspondence that Scottish sources were used as a basis for the articles contained in the *AE*. The sources named in the correspondence, identifiable through the information given, are all Australian. The Australian origin of *AE* material is confirmed by the illustrations. Photos, drawings and maps were in many cases created by the authors' relatives and acquaintances.[351] Other sources for illustrations mentioned in the correspondences include E.G. Mill's *Internal Geography*, Frederick McCoys *Prodromus of the Zoology of Victoria*, A.H.S. Lucas' *The Animals of Australia*, some illustrations published in the Federal British Association Handbook of 1914 and a picture of the Federal Parliament House by the government printer.[352] Apart from Mill's work, which cannot be identified from the information given, all of the above works are Australian publications. The sources for the *AE* were clearly dominated by Australian material. Hence the second reason for Jones' argument that the

[349] See for example: Letter from Nicholas Colston Lockyer on 25 October 1923 to Jose, NLA: MS 708.
[350] See for example: Letter from Robertson on 19 November 1928 to Charles Henry Bertie, ML: MS 314/12.
[351] See: Maps: Letter from Taylor on 2 January 1919 to Carter, NLA: MS 708. – Photos and drawings: Letter from Angus & Robertson on 8 October 1923 to Harry Burrell, NLA: MS 708. – Letter from Burrell on 12 October 1923 to Jose, NLA: MS 708. – Letter from Tillyard on 10 August 1917 to Carter, NLA: MS 708. – Letter from Tillyard on 17 October 1918 to Carter, NLA: MS 708. – Letter from Carter on 30 December 1921 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/17.
[352] See: Frederick McCoy, *Prodromus of the Zoology of Victoria: Or, Figures and Descriptions of the Living Species of all Classes of the Victorian Indigenous Animals* (John Ferres, Melbourne 1885/1890). (Baldwin Spencer calls the work *Prodromus of the Natural History of Australia*. (Letter from Baldwin Spencer on 14 September 1918 to Carter, NLA: MS 708.)) – A.H.S. Lucas, *The Animals of Australia: Mammals, Reptiles and Amphibians* (Whitcombe & Tombs, Melbourne 1909). (Mentioned in: Letter from Spencer on 14 September 1918 to Carter, NLA: MS 708.) – G.H. Knibbs (ed.), *Federal Handbook* (Government Printer, Melbourne 1914). (Mentioned in: Letter from Baldwin Spencer on 8 July 1920 to Carter, NLA: MS 708.) – For the picture of the Federal Parliament House see: Letter from Jose on 8 November 1919 to Shenstone, ML: MS 314/41. – E.G. Mill's *Internal Geography* could not be identified from the information given. (See: Letter from Taylor on 19 December 1917 to Carter, NLA: MS 708.)

general knowledge was presented to Australians through Scottish eyes is disproved. The production of the *AE*, at least in the planning phase, signified an effort to create a genuine national work.

The intended function of the *AE* was made explicit in a draft for a prospectus, written by Thomas George Tucker, at George Robertson's request:

> *Our object in publishing the Australian Encyclopaedia is to supply in a sufficiently concise form all such information concerning Australia and matters Australian as is likely to be sought by intelligent persons in any part of the world.*[353]

George Robertson aimed to create a work that informed its users solely about Australia. The quote reveals what audience Robertson had in mind for his product: it catered for a general, worldwide audience. A letter from the historian Charles Bean to Lieutenant-Colonel R. Williams reveals that the producers of the encyclopaedia strove to put Australian matters in a positive light. Bean asks Williams for details concerning the Australian Air Force, explaining that the editor of the *AE* had told him that their text on the Australian Flying Corps was not good enough, because it was 'too cold and unsympathetic'.[354] The encyclopaedia was not only to inform about Australia, but to support the consolidation of the Australian nation within Australia as well as in other countries. Australians were indirectly summoned to be proud of their country. To everybody else it was demonstrated that Australia was about to take its place in the world. It had its own national encyclopaedia. The encyclopaedia may even have been constructed to support the growth of the Australian nation, if the writer Thomas Griffith Taylor was in any way representative for the general opinion of the *AE* producers. Taylor was concerned about 'future Australian prosperity' which he felt was forwarded scientifically by distributing extensive 'knowledge of our meteorology & climatology'.[355]

The correspondence on the production of the *AE* has revealed how the encyclopaedia was planned. The prefaces and appearances of the encyclopaedias allow similar insights into the ordering principle, the content and the function of the *AE* as well as *Chambers*.

---

[353] Thomas George Tucker in a draft for a prospectus on the *AE* (at Robertson's request), undated, NLA: MS 708. See also: Letter from Tucker to Robertson, undated, NLA: MS 708.
[354] Letter from Bean on 31 December 1923 to R. Williams, NAA: AWM 38, 3.
[355] Letter from Griffith Taylor on 1 November 1925 to Jose, NLA: MS 708.

3.2.2 Presenting Encyclopaedias: Metatexts and Design

How were the *AE* and *Chambers* presented to their readers? What are the similarities and differences in the prefaces, appearances and other aspects of the encyclopaedias' presentation?[356] The prefaces of *Chambers* and the *AE* are very different from one another. They are divergent in their tone: whereas the *AE* displays great pride in the achievement of the work, the preface of *Chambers* shows more than pride, being written in a style that could be called arrogant. Encyclopaedias written previously are dismissed in a sarcastic tone. Large encyclopaedias that aimed at 'superseding all other books' are ridiculed and brief encyclopaedias accused of 'omitting all that the consultant is likely to wish to learn, all that he is not likely to know already'.[357] The contents of the encyclopaedias' prefaces differ too. The editors of *Chambers* use the preface to make the aim of their work explicit, Angus & Robertson mainly describe the production process of the encyclopaedia and provide some information on the sources used. They name the *AE's* editors and their helpers and lament the loss of contributors. *Chambers'* preface is committed to explaining its purpose whereas the preface of the *AE* is more about the people and sources involved in the production of the work. Concerning their principle of disposition, the prefaces do not disclose much. Angus & Robertson remain completely silent about the subject, and Chambers only write that they broke larger themes into various articles and promise to 'secure a systematic conspectus' of subjects.[358] They lay claim to both an alphabetical and a systematic approach. In regard to their principle of lemmatising, Chambers remain silent.

As explained in chapter one, Angus & Robertson misleadingly tell their readers in the preface that the *AE* was first planned as 'a historical and biographical record', and that later scientific subjects were added. They claim that their scientific articles were often 'the first trustworthy summaries yet published of scientific knowledge previously accessible only in the journals of learned societies.'[359] This pride to present new general knowledge demonstrates once more that Angus & Robertson hoped to produce something new, an independent and genuine Australian product.

---

[356] It has been established that *Chambers* was an adapted version of Brockhaus' *Conversations-Lexicon* of 1852. Therefore an analysis of the *Conversations-Lexicon*'s preface would be useful. However the *Conversations-Lexicon* of 1852 did not have a preface.
[357] Patrick and Geddie, 'Preface', *Chambers*, vol. 1.
[358] Ibid.
[359] Jose and Carter, 'Preface', *AE*, vol. 1, p. v.

Chambers did not explicitly name any subjects their encyclopaedia was supposed to cover. The encyclopaedia was supposed to be 'at once comprehensive, compact, accurate, lucid, readable, and handy for reference.'[360] The producers also wrote that their readers would have a secure grip on science: 'We may claim that our assiduous readers will hold the eel of science a good way up the tail'.[361] Was *Chambers* planned to be mainly a scientific reference work? To find an answer to this question is it essential to examine what was meant by the term 'science'. Today 'science' signifies 'any system of knowledge that is concerned with the physical world and its phenomena and that entails unbiased observations and systematic experimentation'.[362] We distinguish science from the humanities and – to a lesser degree – from the social sciences.[363] The article 'science' in *Chambers* suggests that science in the 1920s was not clearly distinguished from the humanities or the social sciences. The author of the article, Patrick Geddes, only makes a clear distinction between philosophy and religion on the one hand and science on the other.[364] It seems that the boundaries between science and art were more fluid than they are today. Areas such as history, archaeology, anthropology and ethnology, now classified as part of the humanities, although not explicitly called 'sciences' are all mentioned within a scientific context in *Chambers*. The term 'science' in the preface of *Chambers* was probably used with this more general meaning.

The quote about the 'eel of science' indicates that the purpose of *Chambers* was to provide a first access to 'science'. *Chambers'* scope was established between brief encyclopaedias and those encyclopaedias that wanted to supersede all previous books. The knowledge gained through the reading of *Chambers* could then be deepened through further reading, as the full quote about the 'eel of science' indicates:

> *We may claim that our assiduous readers will hold the eel of science a good way up the tail; and a glance at the bibliographies which end very many of the articles will prove that we indicate how to exchange that grip for a securer and more comprehensive [one, N.K.].*[365]

The description of the *AE* as a 'record' in the encyclopaedia's preface is again misleading. As the correspondence on the production of the *AE* has revealed, the work

[360] Patrick and Geddie, 'Preface', *Chambers*, vol. 1.
[361] Ibid.
[362] 'Science', *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-9066286, accessed 19 April 06.
[363] 'Humanities', *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-9041479, accessed 2 May 06.
[364] Patrick Geddes, 'Science', *Chambers*, vol. 9, p. 167.
[365] Patrick and Geddie, 'Preface', *Chambers*, vol. 1.

was not planned to be an objective record, but a political instrument, supporting the consolidation of the Australian nation. This plan is not made explicit in the preface of the *AE*, but the pride displayed gives the nationalist nature of the work away: 'We take pride in publishing an encyclopaedia conceived, written, edited, printed and produced entirely within the Commonwealth of Australia'.[366]

The *AE* is unusual in revealing some of its sources in the preface. As mentioned in the first chapter, from the end of the nineteenth century, it had become more and more unusual for encyclopaedias to explicitly name their aims, values and sources. Angus & Robertson in contrast were generously naming the sources they were indebted to. They write that they had used many 'original documents' and that they were 'indebted to the magnificent collection housed in the Mitchell Library at Sydney'.[367] They admit to have consulted two Commonwealth publications, the *Historical Records of Australia* and the *Official Yearbook of the Commonwealth*. Like the *Official Yearbook*, the *Historical Records of Australia* were a publication by the Australian government.[368] Angus & Robertson expressed their gratitude towards a couple of institutions that had provided them with pictures for the encyclopaedia: the Australian Museum, the Linnean Society of New South Wales and the Sydney Technological Museum. Judging from the information gathered from the correspondence, Angus & Robertson named most of the important sources they had used for the encyclopaedia, all being Australian. Wiley's claim that many primary sources had been consulted is confirmed once again. The *AE* was thus not only planned as a genuine and independent national work, but also presented as such to its users, although the political aim was not made explicit. *Chambers* was not mentioned as a model in the preface. Had the producers of the *AE* lost sight of their original intention to base their work on *Chambers*?

At this point a short digression on an intriguing aspect of the *AE's* preface is necessary. After the introduction of the encyclopaedia's main editors, Jose and Carter, Angus & Robertson name an additional person, Persia Campbell. It is not clear what function Campbell had in the production. The preface only explains that she 'joined the staff in 1923'.[369] This is the only time this woman, who had completed both a Masters of

[366] Jose and Carter, 'Preface', *AE*, vol. 1, p. vi.
[367] Ibid. p. v.
[368] Fredk. Watson (ed.), *Historical Records of Australia* (Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, Sydney 1914–1925).
[369] Jose and Carter, 'Preface', *AE*, vol. 1, p. v.

Arts and Masters of Science, becomes visible. There is no correspondence by Persia Campbell among the Angus & Robertson papers and she is nowhere mentioned in the correspondence on the production of the *AE*. What was the reason for the invisibility of this staff member? Was she 'only' a secretary and therefore not considered to be important? Was she an editor, but not mentioned as such because she was a woman? The latter interpretation makes sense: in the history of encyclopaedias up until the twentieth century, female editors or authors were very unusual.

In terms of metatexts, there is another difference between the *AE* and *Chambers*. Whereas the *AE* contains a full list of contributors (in volume one preceding the actual entries, in volume two at the end of the book), *Chambers* only has a list of 'the more important articles' at the beginning of each volume, including the names of the respective authors. Concerning their design, the encyclopaedias are almost identical. Both are bound in green buckram.[370] On the spine, they display their title, volume number, alphabetic range, the characteristic 'illustrated' and the name of their publishers. The gold fonts are identical, and the spines are decorated with the same floral designs. The design inside the encyclopaedias is identical too, featuring the same page layout and font. However, there are some telling differences between the two works. The embossed pictures on the covers of the encyclopaedias are different. The *AE* features a map of Australia, *Chambers* the head of Athena, the Greek goddess of wisdom. This opposition between the implicit claim of universal wisdom on one hand and knowledge focussed on Australia on the other is mirrored in the *Chambers* subtitle. *Chambers'* full title is *The Illustrated Chambers's Encyclopaedia: A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge*. As hinted at in the preface, in contrast to the *AE Chambers* claimed to present universal knowledge, not restricted to a geographical area, time period or subject. The frontispiece, printed on the first page of every *Chambers* volume, confirms this claim on universal knowledge, combining Athena with Atlas. It shows two seated female figures, one with an owl, the other one with a spindle, and Atlas carrying the world in between them. Both figures depict Athena, in her role as goddess of wisdom (owl) and as the patron of industry and science (spindle).

The *AE* was not supplied with a subtitle, but follows its model in displaying pictures at the beginning of each volume: the first volume of the *AE* opens up with the coat of arms of the Commonwealth, the second with a map of Australia. Thus both

[370] *Chambers* described here is the edition that was sold in Australia. The British version was red instead of green.

volumes are framed by symbols with strong national references, indication again that the *AE* focusses on the Australian nation. The map of Australia is not an ordinary one, showing no names of towns, rivers or mountains. It features something much more intriguing: the countries of the whole of Europe are rearranged and turned to fit into the outline of the Australian map, leaving some space around the edges of the European countries. Great Britain is squeezed into the North-Eastern part of Queensland, together with Sardinia and Corsica. It seems that Angus & Robertson wanted to show the users of the encyclopaedia that Australia was much larger than Europe, and Great Britain only a small fragment of it. Australia was made to look important.

3.2.3 Content and Ordering Principle

To what extent is the original plan to use *Chambers* as a model for the *AE* visible in the final ordering principle used and in the content of the encyclopaedias? Since both encyclopaedias are alphabetical, only the lemmatising aspect of the ordering principle needs further investigation. As demonstrated above, the *AE* was planned along national lines. Was this plan successful? The following table shows the number and types of lemmata that are included in the *AE*:

People	875	33%
Animals	711	27%
Plants	581	22%
Rest	462	18%
Total	**2629**	**100%**

This tabulation shows that about a third of the entries are people, almost exclusively men, about a quarter animals and a quarter plants. Lemmata referring to people, animals and plants take up more than 80% of the encyclopaedia. As Herren and Michel's warning of the 'Lemma-Falle' ('lemma trap') makes clear, the prominence of a certain type of

lemmata does not mean that other subjects were neglected.[371] Labelling an entry with a title (or a lemma) does not prevent the producers of the encyclopaedia from including knowledge that might not be expected under the lemma. The prominence of certain lemmata does mean though that a specific outlook on the chosen knowledge was taken.

All of the people listed in the *AE* had strong connections with the Australian nation. Of twenty randomly chosen people contained in the encyclopaedia, all had either migrated to Australia, lived or worked in Australia or at least visited the country several times.[372] For the encyclopaedia makers, the most important aspect of the listed people seems to have been their contribution to the Australian nation. This can be seen in sentences like 'Daley's work was unique in the Australian poetry of his time (…) his work at its best is probably the best done in Australia',[373] or 'he initiated in Australia the modern practice of government through an assembly composed partly of clergy and partly of laymen elected by the parishes',[374] or 'he (…) was the most important – and often the only – Catholic priest in Australia'.[375] No matter how famous someone was if a person did not have a connection with Australia, the person was not considered to be worth an entry. For example there is an entry on the son of the poet Lord Tennyson but not on the poet himself.[376] Whereas the poet played no role for the Australian nation, his son was governor of South Australia and later the second governor-general of the Commonwealth. The only person standing out of the selection of twenty – military, politicians, jurists, scientists, priests, artists and poets – is James Hardy Vaux, a convict who was deported to Australia three times. It is extraordinary to find an entry on a convict in an encyclopaedia that was produced at a time when most Australians were still ashamed about convict ancestry.

In Australia in the 1920s, the nation's convict past was still a very sensitive issue, and this did not change until after the Second World War. The Australian population was

[371] Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 13.
[372] Sir James Wilson Agnew (*AE*, vol. 1, p. 40); Charles Harvey Bagot (vol. 1, pp. 119–120); Bonaventure Cerretti (vol. 1, p. 250); Victor James William Patrick Daley (vol. 1, p. 354); Sir John Eardley Eardley-Wilmot (vol. 1, pp. 393–394); Sir Frances Forbes (vol. 1, p. 480); Rowland Hassall (vol. 1, p. 603); Sir William Hill Irvine (vol. 1, pp. 676–677); August Kavel (vol. 1, p. 692); Edward Lord (vol. 1, p. 761); Nikolai Nicolaevitch Mikluho-Maklay (vol. 2, p. 82); Sir Henry Wylie Norman (vol. 2, p. 211); Charles Perry (vol. 2, p. 287); Sir Harry Holdsworth Rawson (vol. 2, p. 375); Sir Gerald Strickland (vol. 2, p. 502); John Joseph Therry (vol. 2, p. 548); James Hardy Vaux (vol. 2, pp. 611–612); Sir George Frederick Verdon (vol. 2, p. 617); Samuel Albert White (vol. 2, p. 666); Blamire Young (vol. 2, pp. 740–741).
[373] 'Daley, Victor James William Patrick', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 354.
[374] Wilfrid Backhouse Alexander, 'Perry, Charles', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 287.
[375] Eris O'Brien, 'Therry, John Joseph', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 548.
[376] 'Tennyson, Lord', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 546.

burdened with an ingrained anxiety about the so-called 'convict stain'. As a consequence, the convict past was not an issue Australian historians easily wrote about.[377] If they did, they risked having their work rejected by publishers, as happened to the historian George Arnold Wood with his book on early New South Wales. (However, Wood did manage to have his work published, by reading chapters to the Royal Australian Historical Society and getting them into their journal.[378]) Thus by including the subject of convictism in the *AE* – there are many more apart from the entry on Vaux – the producers of the work broke a taboo. At the same time, they managed to give the topic a definitive twist to the positive. According to the *AE,* Australian society was not only to a very small degree built on convict ancestry, but also most convicts had not been rogues, but political prisoners.[379] Users of the encyclopaedia could conclude that the Australian nation was not tainted by a 'convict stain'. The *AE* had relieved them from worrying about a topic with shameful implications.

The two next largest categories of lemmata in the *AE* are animals and plants, taking up almost half of the *AE*. This could arouse the suspicion that the encyclopaedia was shaped by the terms of the biological scientist, and not, as suggested in the correspondence, according to national criteria. This suspicion is not confirmed. The editors only included Australian animals and plants, or animals or plants that had been introduced to Australia. One looks in vain for a 'tiger', a 'moose' or a 'tulip'. Interestingly, more than 60% of the animals in the encyclopaedia are either birds or fish. The encyclopaedia makers may have had a personal interest in birds and fish. But the prominence of these animals is not so surprising, considering the large range of Australian birds and fish. It is characteristic that animals and plants – in other words nature – play such an important role in the encyclopaedia. It seems that the editors wanted the Australian nation to be seen as being closely bound to nature.

---

[377] Brian H. Fletcher, *Australian History in New South Wales 1888 to 1938* (University of NSW Press, Sydney 1993) p. 152. See also: Hirst, *The Sentimental Nation*, p. 33. And: Mandle, 'Cricket', p. 233.
[378] Stuart Macintyre and Julian Thomas, *The Discovery of Australian History 1890–1939* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1995) p. 20.
[379] See: Thomas George Tucker, 'Convicts', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 297. See also 'Irish Exiles', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 668–669. – 'Muir, Thomas', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 154–155. – 'Palmer, Thomas Fyshe', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 251. – 'Transportation', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 581–587. These entries refer to one another and through this net of references suggest that convicts were mainly political prisoners.

The remaining 16% of the *AE* lemmata cover a wide range of subjects with importance for the Australian nation:[380]

Subject	**Lemmata (examples)**
Geography	Adelaide; Australia, Geography of; Climate; Geology; New South Wales
Population	Aborigines; Population
History	Australia, Discovery of; Chronological Table; Convicts
Politics and State	Colonial Office; Federation; Police; White Australia
Military	Australian Imperial Force (this entry also deals with the First World War, including Gallipoli)
Church	Anglican Church; Baptists; Jews
Education	Education, Public; Libraries, Public; Universities
Agriculture	Agriculture; Bee Farming; Farming
Industry	Brewing; Mining; Paper Making; Shearing
Work Life	Eight-hour System; Pensions; Strikes
Economy and Commerce	Commonwealth Bank; Currency; Geography, Economic; Trade and

[380] The table is not complete, it only lists examples of entries.

	Commerce
Telecommunications, Transport and Technique	Irrigation and Water Conservation; Harbours; Lighthouses; Overland Telegraph-line; Pacific Cable; Rails; Septic Tank
Mineral Resources	Coal; Diamonds; Gemstones; Gold, Discovery of; Oil; Opal; Sapphires; Steel
Culture	Art; Drama; Literature; Museum; Music; Theatre
Sports	Cricket; Football; Golf; Racing; Tennis
Health	Public Health
Food	Bread; Butter; Cheese; Coffee

The lemmata above are not always on the same level of categorisation. For example we find entries on 'Gemstones' in the *AE*, but also 'Diamonds', 'Opal' and 'Sapphires'. 'Diamonds', 'Opal' and 'Sapphires' are hyponyms to 'Gemstones' and one would expect them to appear as examples in the article on gemstones, and not as separate entries. They *are* mentioned in the article on gemstones, where they are described as 'the most important gemstones' in Australia.[381] This explains why there are separate entries on these gemstones, but not on amethysts or moonstones:[382] Diamonds, opals and sapphires seem to have been more important for the Australian nation than other gemstones.

This national ordering principle is also visible on a microlevel, as the entries on 'Pigs' and 'Bread' may demonstrate. Pigs are not native Australian animals, but were

[381] 'Gemstones', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 501.
[382] The entry on sapphires is empty and refers back to the articles 'Gemstones' and 'Mineralogy'.

introduced by the first white settlers. Nevertheless, the *AE* entry only treats pigs in an Australian context, and the author stresses that pigs in Australia do very well:

> *The pig succeeds admirably in Australia and, with the exception of a few rare local outbreaks of preventable sickness, is remarkably healthy. He has made himself perfectly at home in the continent, running wild in many areas, such as the Macquarie marshes and the 'watercourses' in the north-west of New South Wales, the interior of northern Queensland, and the northern portion of the Northern Territory. In some places his appearance has reverted to that of his ancient progenitors, but for the most part the improved type has been preserved to a remarkable degree, especially in the Northern Territory, where food is abundant and easy to obtain. The wild pig's choicest delicacy is the root of the water-lilies which abound in the lagoons and billabongs. Although extremely wild when at large, when brought in he fattens well for market purposes.*[383]

The author of the article on 'Bread' strengthens a sense of an Australian community by comparing Australian bread favourably with 'European bread'. Australian bread is the focus from the very first sentence, where the authors explains that 'bread made in Australia differs from that made in Europe'. According to the article, in Australia the bread making system 'is quicker and involves less handling' and the flours used are of better quality 'so that they "rise" better, hold more water, and make a larger loaf from the same quantity of flour'.[384]

How does the *AE's* national ordering principle compare to *Chambers'*? The entries under the letter 'N' may here represent the ten volumes of *Chambers*. In contrast to the *AE*, animals and plants are not prominent in the ordering principle of the Scottish encyclopaedia. Lemmata that could be subsumed under the modern terms of science and technique, also including subjects such as medicine and industry, only make up for about 17% of all of the entries. A large number of these lemmata concern chemistry, for example chemical elements and processes. The biographical part, that takes up a third of the *AE*, is not particularly prominent in *Chambers*, only about 16% of the lemmata concerning individual people.

The lemmata that make up for the largest part of *Chambers* are place names – countries, cities, watercourses, etc. – and peoples, taking up approximately 43% of the encyclopaedia. The remaining lemmata – about a quarter – cover subjects such as philosophy, religion, mythology, history, politics, law, art and literature. It is striking how many lemmata deal with the first three of the just mentioned. *Chambers'* ordering

[383] Walter Scott Campbell, 'Pigs', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 298.
[384] Henry George Chapman, 'Bread', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 200.

principle suggests a great interest in ancient cultures, places and peoples. These places and peoples, as well as the individual biographies, not only cover Scotland or Britain, but several continents, with a preference for Europe, North-America and Asia. Of all of the geographically oriented lemmata only about 16% are British places, and of those only about a quarter Scottish ones. It seems that *Chambers* signified a genuine attempt to create a work of universal knowledge. Thus the nationally oriented ordering principle of the *AE* signified an attempt at independence from its Scottish model. The only congruency between the ordering principles of the two works is the common alphabetical disposition.

That the *AE* applied a different ordering principle does not imply though that there were no congruencies in the content of the presented knowledge. Were there transfers of knowledge between the two encyclopaedias, along the web of the empire? Did the makers of the *AE* use material from *Chambers* or vice versa?

3.2.3.1 Jose's Articles

Since Jose worked for Angus & Robertson and Chambers at the same time, he could have used the material of one encyclopaedia for his work on the other. Because of the simultaneous production, an analysis of the encyclopaedias cannot reveal in which direction such transfers went. But the large amount of correspondence on the production of the *AE* and on Jose's work for Chambers offers the unique chance to embed the encyclopaedias in the context of their production. The correspondence gives an insight into how the *AE* and *Chambers* influenced one another, and how the productions of the encyclopaedias were entangled through the overlap of staff members. An analysis of the encyclopaedias in connection with the correspondence sheds light on three issues: (1) Were Jose's suggestions to include new articles in *Chambers* accepted? (2) Were Jose's suggestions for changes in various *Chambers* articles taken up? (3) Were there any knowledge transfers between the *AE* and *Chambers*?

Correspondence reveals that Jose suggested at least five new articles for the new edition of *Chambers*. In a letter to the editor David Patrick in September 1910, Jose proposed new articles on the subjects of Anabranch, John Ballance, Sir E. Barton,

Governor Bowen and Governor Arthur.[385] All of these articles begin with the letters A and B, and it is likely that Jose suggested articles for other letters too. Patrick was interested to comply with Jose's request. He wrote: 'And I shall do my best to get room for a short new article on Governor Arthur, Anabranch (3 lines), Ballance, (John), Sir E. Barton, and Governor Bowen.'[386] Two of these articles, on Governor Arthur and Sir Edmund Barton, were finally included in the new edition. Are there any congruences in the content of these articles with the articles in the *AE*? The articles on Barton do not show any suspicious similarities, and there are differences that suggest different sources. For example, the articles disagree on Barton's date of death: the *AE* names the 7 January 1920, whereas *Chambers* claims that Barton died on the 6 January.[387]

The article on Governor Arthur in *Chambers* is a great deal shorter than the one in the *AE*. There are no identical formulations, but some information contained in the articles is strikingly similar. In both encyclopaedias it is argued that Arthur was despotic, but at the same time the governor is defended for this character trait. According to both encyclopaedias this despotism was a necessity, for example to contain bushrangers and the 'natives'.[388] Both encyclopaedias say that the population of Tasmania trebled during Arthur's rule, and that trade increased by 1200 per cent (although the *AE* expressed it in absolute numbers). Either one encyclopaedia drew from the other one, or the same sources were used as a basis for both articles. Most likely, Jose had written both articles: the article in the *AE* is not signed, and Jose had once complained to Chambers that apart from a few articles he had to write all non-signed articles himself.[389] Since the article in the *AE* (almost two and half columns) is longer than the one in *Chambers* (not even half a column), the article in the *AE* may have been the original one.[390]

Jose also suggested various changes to some of the already existing articles. In September 1910, he wrote to Patrick:

---

[385] Letter from Jose on 21 September 1910 to 'the editor' (*Chambers*), NLS: Dep. 341/400. (The original of this document is contained in NAA: AWM39, 6. However, the NAA document does not include the attached list of suggestions by Jose.)
[386] Letter from Patrick on 3 November 1910 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[387] 'Barton, Sir Edmund', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 142. – 'Barton, Sir Edmund', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 769.
[388] 'Arthur, Sir George', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 82. – 'Arthur, Sir George', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 469.
[389] Letter from Jose on 30 November 1926 to 'the editor' (*Chambers*), NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[390] The volume of *Chambers* containing the article on Arthur appeared a year earlier (1924) than the respective volume of the *AE*. This does not mean though that the *AE* had copied from *Chambers*. Both encyclopaedias were produced over a long time period and it is not possible to determine with certainty which article had been written earlier.

> *Your letter appears to contemplate only the revision and possible rewriting of articles already in the Encyclopaedia. I suppose this includes Australian additions to certain general articles which at present make no reference to our conditions.*[391]

To this letter, Jose attached a list with concrete suggestions regarding a whole series of articles: 'Absentee', 'Acclimatisation', 'Adder', 'Adelaide', 'Adulteration', 'Alien', 'Alighar', 'Amateur', 'Ambulance', 'Anglican', 'Anthropology', 'Arbitration', 'Archbishop', 'Army', 'Artesian wells' and 'Australasia'.[392] Again Patrick was willing to take up Jose's suggestions.[393] The majority of Jose's suggestions appear in the new edition of *Chambers*.[394]

Two articles seem to have been particularly close to Jose's heart. One of them was 'Arbitration'. In his letters to Chambers, he brings up the subject again and again, explaining why he regarded 'Arbitration' to be so important. Jose believed that Australia was exemplary regarding its arbitration law, and that Australian compulsory arbitration laws were 'likely to be the pattern for several other parts of the Empire'.[395] Therefore, proud Jose wanted the users of *Chambers* to be presented with an accurate picture of arbitration in Australia. Patrick agreed with Jose on the importance of 'Arbitration':

> *Compulsory Arbitration in Australia and New Zealand is so important that I shall secure you a column and a half or thereby for an addition to Arbitration (by cancelling and abridging elsewhere).*[396]

Australasian arbitration legislation received about a column in the second part of the article, namely in *Arbitration and Conciliation in Labour Disputes*.[397] The article was not written by Jose but by Sir George Askwith, but Jose was allowed to put forth his view on arbitration in Australasia.

The other topic that seems to have been especially important for Jose was the matter of Artesian wells. Jose complained about the old article on Artesian wells that it

---

[391] Letter from Jose on 21 September 1910 to 'the editor' (*Chambers*), NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[392] Ibid. All of Jose's suggestions that are mentioned in the following were made in this letter (if not indicated otherwise).
[393] Letter from Patrick on 3 November 1910 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[394] In another letter to Chambers, Jose proposes the revision of articles concerning Australian animals, in particular the one on the 'Ceratodus'. (Letter from Jose on 27 May 1914 to 'the editor' (*Chambers*), NLS: Dep. 341/400.) The article 'Ceratodus' was altered, but not because of Jose's letter. Geddie told Jose: 'The last sentence of "Ceratodus" has already disappeared in the revision by the author.' (Letter from Geddie on 27 July 1914 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.)
[395] Letter from Jose on 30 July 1912 to Patrick, NLS: Dep. 341/400. – Letter from Jose on 21 September 1910 to Patrick, NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[396] Letter from Patrick on 3 November 1910 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[397] 'Arbitration and Conciliation in Labour Disputes', *Chambers*, vol. 1, pp. 381–382.

made ‘no mention of the great artesian basin which is so extremely important a feature of our inland water-supply’ and that it referred to areas that he judged to have ‘no true artesian wells at all’. Jose wanted to have ‘at least a couple of inches for the real facts, which are of immense importance in the development of the Commonwealth’.[398] Jose was successful with his complaint and was allowed to write the part on Australian Artesian wells in the article, whose other parts were written by somebody else.[399]

Thus the articles that were closest to Jose’s heart were changed in the way he wanted them. Many of his other suggestions were successful too. For the article ‘Absentee’ Jose successfully proposed to add a ‘note on taxation of absentee landlords in Australia & N.Z.’.[400] His request to add comments about the acclimatisation of Australian plants in the Roman Campagna and in South Africa in the entry ‘Acclimatisation’ was granted.[401] Jose’s proposition to insert a ‘note on Australia’s prohibition of certain alien immigration’ in the article ‘Alien’ was successful too.[402] The definition of ‘Australasia’, including Fiji, was corrected in the new edition, as proposed by Jose.[403] Regarding the entry ‘Adder’ Jose mentioned in his letter that ‘the Death Adder is a different species in different States’. This was probably referring to the identification of the death adder in the earlier edition of *Chambers*, published in 1908, as a New South Wales serpent.[404] In the new edition the death adder was now called an Australian serpent.[405] Jose’s wish to include the remark that there were ‘Australian Acts dealing drastically’ with adulteration, was also fulfilled.[406]

Jose was dissatisfied that the article ‘Anthropology’ put the ‘Australian blacks’ on an equal level with the ‘Digger Indians’, and asked for a re-classification of the Australian Aborigines. The new article does not contain such qualifications of the Australian Aborigines, but the article had been completely rewritten and there was no mention of the

[398] Letter from Jose on 21 September 1910 to Patrick, NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[399] Letter from Geddie on 16 June 1914 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[400] Letter from Jose on 21 September 1910 to ‘the editor’ (*Chambers*), NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[401] ‘Acclimatisation’, *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 31.
[402] ‘Alien’, *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 164.
[403] ‘Australasia’, *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 590. – However, Patrick told Jose after receiving his suggestions that he already had enough material on the subject of ‘Australasia’. Perhaps the article would also have been changed without Jose’s suggestion.
[404] ‘Adder’, *Chambers’s Encyclopaedia: A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge*, vol. 1, David Patrick (ed.) (W&R Chambers, Edinburgh 1908) p. 50.
[405] Ibid.
[406] ‘Adulteration’, *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 64.

Australian Aborigines at all.[407] It is not clear whether Jose's suggestion had had any influence on the new article or not.

Two of Jose's comments had nothing to do with Australia. He suggested that the 'Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College, which is developing into a great Mohammedan University for the British Empire' was mentioned in the article 'Aligarh'. Patrick told Jose that 'indeed the article Aligarh has been already re-written so as to take account of the Mohammedan College'.[408] Jose's effort concerning the article 'Avonmouth' ended similarly. Patrick informed Jose that he had enough material on the topic already, as he had been in Avonmouth lately himself.[409] The proposition Jose made for the article 'Avonmouth' demonstrates once more that he, a proud supporter of Australian national identity, was also a proud Englishman. Jose wrote:

> *Again it has nothing to do with me: but I am a Bristol man, and I do hope the new edition will have a correct account of the docks at Avonmouth, which are the city's property, not that of any railway company.*[410]

In the new *Chambers*, the docks are indeed described as the city's property.[411]

Some of Jose's suggestions were not taken up. Jose's proposition 'to add the Australian definition' of 'Amateur' was not granted.[412] His offer to 'forward a description of the N.S.W. pattern cart' for the article 'Ambulance' was disregarded, although Patrick had written to Jose that his information on the topics 'Amateur' and 'Ambulance' was welcome.[413] It is not clear whether the editors of *Chambers* had decided that the articles were too long, the information provided irrelevant or whether Jose had not ended up forwarding the information on the two topics. Jose's suggestion to use a map 'of Adelaide & suburbs' to illustrate the article 'Adelaide' instead of the old map showing the whole region around Adelaide was not taken up.[414] Jose's concern that the Australian usage of the term 'Anglican' was neglected was not considered for the new edition of *Chambers*.[415] His wish to include Australian bishops into the list in the article

[407] 'Anthropology', *Chambers*, vol. 1, pp. 312–316.
[408] Letter from Patrick on 3 November 1910 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[409] Letter from Patrick on 3 November 1910 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[410] Letter from Jose on 21 September 1910 to 'the editor' (*Chambers*), NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[411] 'Avonmouth', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 620.
[412] Letter from Jose on 21 September 1910 to 'the editor' (*Chambers*), NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[413] Letter from Patrick on 3 November 1910 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[414] See: 'Adelaide', *Chambers* (1908), p. 53. – 'Adelaide', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 53.
[415] 'Anglican', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 276.

'Archbishop' was not granted.[416] And finally, Jose's suggestion to include 'a short description of the new Australian army scheme' in the article 'Army' was disregarded.[417] However, Chambers' disregard of some of Jose's suggestions does not mean that the publisher disliked them. Patrick had told Jose from the start that

> *I hope to benefit by them [the suggestions, N.K.] all, if not to utilise them every one in the way you suggest; in some cases it may prove difficult to get the space where you propose an addition. But now and always I shall be glad of all such suggestions and do my best to incorporate them somewhere in some way.*[418]

It was probably a lack of space that prevented Chambers to take up all of Jose's suggestions. The same applies to the proposed new articles that were not included. It is clear that the editors of *Chambers* were very willing to alter knowledge in their encyclopaedia according to what was offered to them by an Australian correspondent. Jose's suggestions reveal once more that he was keenly interested in showing Australia in a good light. 'Adulteration' for instance shows that Jose wanted to make clear to the British users of the encyclopaedia that Australia had no pity for criminals and dealt drastically with them. This was vital for a good image of Australia, which had been struggling for a long time to get rid of its 'convict stain'. Jose's proposition regarding 'Adulteration' might have been part of this effort. Another example for Jose's eagerness to paint Australia favourably is the article 'Anthropology', where Jose wanted the Australian Aborigines to be classified higher than other black people.

The correspondence reveals that Jose revised or wrote the following entries for *Chambers*: 'Adelaide', 'Australia', 'Barton', 'Bischoff, Mt.', 'Bendigo', 'Brisbane', 'Broken Hill', 'Canberra', 'Deakin, Alfred', 'Gordon, A.L.', 'Hobart', 'Maitland', 'Melbourne', 'New South Wales', 'Perth', 'Queensland', 'South Australia', 'Sydney', 'Tasmania', 'Victoria', 'Western Australia' and 'Zeehan'. Jose also wrote sections for inclusion into the articles 'Education', 'Geography' and probably also 'Agriculture'. He might also have rewritten 'Albany' and may have written 'colony'. Thus most of the articles Jose revised or wrote were concerning places within the Australian nation. Furthermore, Jose worked on some biographies and added an Australian perspective to general articles.

---

[416] 'Archbishop', *Chambers*, vol. 1, pp. 389–390.
[417] R.M. Holden, 'Army', *Chambers* (1908), vol. 1, pp. 431–440.
[418] Letter from Patrick on 3 November 1910 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.

The issue of knowledge transfers will be further pursued by a comparison of five *Chambers* articles Jose revised or wrote with the five corresponding articles in the *AE*. The geographical articles are represented by the one on the capital of Australia, 'Canberra', and the article on the whole nation, 'Australia'. A semi-geographic article, 'Broken Hill', is also treated. The biographies are represented by 'Deakin, Alfred' and the sections in general articles by the one in the article 'Education'.

Canberra

There is some doubt about who wrote the article 'Canberra' in the *AE*. It is likely that Jose had either written it himself or revised it considerably. The article is not signed, and as explained above, Jose seems to have done most of the work on unsigned articles in the *AE*. The article Jose wrote for *Chambers* is much shorter than the one in the *AE*, only about a quarter of a column in comparison with the more than four columns, plus two illustrations, in the *AE*. Whereas *Chambers* only gives a few pieces of information regarding the new capital of Australia – mainly the exact geographical location – the article in the *AE* elaborates on many aspects of the subject. The article starts with an overview of the prehistory of the area where Canberra later was built, and then goes on with a long account of the debates that had preceded the building of Canberra. The article explains which geographical area was finally decided upon and proceeds to naming what had been built so far in the new capital. The article concludes with an exact description of Canberra's location and climate and with some general statistics.

It is evident that the article in *Chambers* was not based on the *AE* article. The statistics used in the two entries are different. In *Chambers*, Canberra is said to be situated '226 miles south-west of Sydney by rail and road',[419] whereas the *AE* indicates that Canberra is '204 miles by rail from Sydney'.[420] *Chambers* tells its readers that the population of the Federal Territory was 2,600,[421] the *AE* speaks of 3,677 'whites'.[422] Jose may have used older statistics for the article in *Chambers*. Maybe the work on the Canberra article for the *AE* had not been begun yet by the time Jose had to deliver his Canberra article to Chambers. There is one interesting concurrence between the two

[419] Jose, 'Canberra', *Chambers*, vol. 2, p. 713.
[420] 'Canberra', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 236.
[421] Jose, 'Canberra', *Chambers*, vol. 2 , p. 713.
[422] 'Canberra', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 236. The article does not specify whether this number referred to the capital only or to the whole Federal Territory.

articles however. Both mention the Federal Military College and the Naval College. This suggests that Jose, the former naval officer, really was the author of both articles. As the above analysis suggests, both articles were very matter-of-fact and dry in their tone.

Australia

The article on Australia was another one close to Jose's heart. In 1910, Jose wrote to Patrick that the article had to 'be considerably revised'.[423] Jose's revisions and additions ended up being so substantial that the article 'Australia' in *Chambers* came to take up almost twelve pages plus several illustrations in contrast to about nine pages in the edition of 1908.[424] In 1914, Jose apologised that the article had 'rather overflowed its set bound' and that he had 'sadly scamped the historical section'.[425] The final article covered various aspects of the subject 'Australia', such as the exact location and size of the country, its naming, its physical features, minerals, climate, flora and fauna, Aborigines, discovery and settlement (also in a political sense), government and defence, population, religion, education, literature, commerce and industry, communications and various statistics. Some of these sections contained material from the 1908 edition of Chambers, but a great deal of it was rewritten entirely.

The sections of *Chambers'* 'Australia' to be compared with knowledge in the *AE* are selected on the basis of the Australian nation building process. The movement towards a national community in Australian literature such as the *Bulletin* is continued in a text *on* Australian literature, in the *AE* article 'Literature' by Sir Archibald Thomas Strong, a professor of English well-known to his contemporaries. In *Chambers'* edition of the 1920s, the section on literature in 'Australia' is new. Are there any analogies between the two descriptions of Australian literature? Did Jose transfer an Australian nationalist perspective to *Chambers*?

Strong starts the entry explaining what he aims to cover in the article, namely what he calls '"pure literature" including all varieties of writing that depend wholly or mainly on imagination, and having poetry, drama, and prose fiction for its main kinds'.[426] Strong provides an overview of other kinds of writing ('applied literature'), then proceeds to

[423] Letter from Jose on 21 September 1910 to Patrick, NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[424] J. O'Halloran, 'Australia', *Chambers* (1908), vol. 1, pp. 586–595.
[425] Letter from Jose on 27 May 1914 to 'the editor' (*Chambers*), NLS: Dep. 341/400.
[426] Archibald Thomas Strong, 'Literature', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 743.

describe the subcategories poetry, prose and drama. In his characterisation of Australian literature, Strong carries the 'bush ethos' into the twentieth century, by making the whole description of Australian literature evolve around the bush. He mentions that Henry Kendall was 'bush-bred',[427] that Marcus Clarke included 'bush life' in his career,[428] and again and again he judges how well somebody had portrayed the bush. About Andrew Paterson and Henry Lawson he says: 'These two are the most widely read of recent Australian poets. Their best work is easy, vigorous, and racy of the bush (sic!).'[429] According to Strong, Louis Esson offered in *Dead Timber* 'a remarkable study of the tragedy and grim humour of the Australian bush life'.[430] Strong makes clear that a good Australian author for him was somebody who wrote about Australia in a distinctive Australian manner. He remarked about the *Bulletin*:

> *The poetry of Australia, up to the stage now reached, had few characteristics (apart from those of subject) which might differentiate it from verse written in other English-speaking countries. Many of her poets had looked upon her merely with the eyes of interested sojourners in the land: a few had even regarded her as a place of exile. But through the vision and enterprise of J.F. Archibald, the founder (in 1881) of the Sydney* Bulletin*, an opening was provided for men who wished to write of Australia as Australians, and to reveal her spirit and atmosphere through the medium of verse or prose. The influence of the* Bulletin *affected many who never contributed to its pages. Men began to write of Australia no longer as a land of exile, but as their own country, to the making of whose destiny they were eager to contribute.*[431]

Authors who were not considered to be Australian on a permanent basis and who did not contribute towards the moulding of an Australian national character were judged negatively by Strong. Hence his negative assessment of Adam Lindsay Gordon:

> *Much of his reflective and dramatic poetry is derivative and inferior, and, despite his vogue in Australia, there is little force in the claim made for him to the title of Australia's national poet. Keenly interested in her life, he was at the same time but a sojourner and an alien within her borders, and only in a very small degree did he help to mould or interpret her national character.*[432]

Strong was very interested in the advancement of an Australian national character. He had strong opinions on what a 'true Australian' should be familiar with and what he should like. He remarked on Bernard O'Dowd that 'his strong sincerity, loftiness of aim, and powerful and original imagination should win him honour from every true Australian.'[433]

---

[427] Ibid.
[428] Ibid. p. 745.
[429] Ibid. p. 744.
[430] Ibid. p. 746.
[431] Ibid. p. 744.
[432] Ibid.
[433] Ibid.

Strong seems to have been intent to counter the fear about Australian inferiority. In his conclusion, Strong through Bernard O'Dowd's words assures his readers that there was nothing that could prevent Australia from producing great authors:

> *Bernard O'Dowd claimed a few years ago that, though Australia so far has produced no poet of the first order, she possesses in several individuals the component parts of such a poet. There is nothing in the condition of her life to forbid such an one arising.*[434]

Not surprisingly, George Robertson, who through Angus & Robertson made a great effort to create a literature for Australia, regarded Strong's nationalist article to be 'one of the best in the book'.[435]

At a first glance, the section on literature in the *Chambers* article on Australia is entirely different from the *AE* article. There are no common formulations, and some of the judgements about authors differ. For example, whereas Strong praised Stephens' 'psychological insight',[436] Jose was not very fond of Brunton Stephens ('studious but rarely inspired verse').[437] Some assessments of authors are very similar though. Just like Strong, Jose dismissed Adam Lindsay Gordon. For Jose, Gordon 'was merely an English schoolboy with a talent for brisk rhyming and a love of horses and the open air that appealed to the Australian audience'.[438] And the encyclopaedia articles agree that in the genre of drama nothing of importance had been produced yet.

The bush is only mentioned once in the article in *Chambers* in contrast to the *AE*,[439] and the *Bulletin*, which Strong held in such high esteem, is ridiculed by Jose for being 'fanatically insistent on Australian "nationality"' and for throwing 'its columns open to all local work with a spark of talent in it'.[440] It is surprising that Jose would criticise an insistence on Australian nationality, since he was a strong promoter of the Australian nation himself. His negative judgement of the *Bulletin* might have had to do with an argument Robertson seems to have had with the editors of the *Bulletin*. In 1926, Robertson had written to author Thomas George Tucker:

> *Miss G. tells me that D.G.S. looked askew when he saw what my pencil had done to his beautifully typed originals; but D.G.S. is [a, N.K.] good Australian,*

[434] Ibid. p. 746.
[435] Letter from Robertson on 29 June 1927 to Archibald Strong, NLA: MS 708.
[436] Strong, 'Literature', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 744.
[437] Jose, 'Australia', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 600.
[438] Ibid.
[439] Ibid.
[440] Ibid.

> *and forebore [sic!] to say what he thought. All good Australians remember how bravely G.R. dealt with the noxious reptiles (BULLETINII biteyourearoh) of the past.*[441]

Maybe the *Bulletin* was seen as a competitor in the production of Australian literature? Whatever the reason for this negative judgement of the *Bulletin*, Jose put a lot of emphasis on a distinctive Australian style of writing, as Strong had done. Even on the *Bulletin* he had to admit that

> *towards the end of the nineties a series of volumes, both in prose and in verse, collected from the* Bulletin's *pages, made known to Australians at large and, in some degree, to oversea critics the rise of a genuine locally-stimulated literary movement.*[442]

Hence, even though Jose put less emphasis on the bush than Strong, he stressed the importance of 'local colour', as is also seen in his assessment of Victor Daley.[443] There is no evidence however that Jose and Strong had copied from one another. Even in the 1908 edition of *Chambers* a lot of emphasis had been put on 'local colour'.[444] Moreover, Jose's description of Australian literature can hardly be labelled as nationalist.

Another section of Jose's article 'Australia' that lends itself for comparison is the part on federation. As set forth in chapter two, federation only played a limited role in the building of Australian nationhood. However, this is a modern judgement, and it would be anachronistic not to analyse this political section because of it. Federation did signify the formal foundation of the Australian nation. A comparison of the federation section with the article 'Federation' in the *AE* can reveal what point of view both encyclopaedias took on the political liberation of the Australian colonies. Did they describe federation from a British or an Australian point of view?

Not surprisingly, the article 'Federation' in the *AE* is much longer than the section in *Chambers* that deals with the topic. Interestingly, the article on federation in the *AE* is not signed. This probably meant that Jose had revised the article to a large degree or even rewritten it. The *AE's* 'Federation' is very different from the section in *Chambers*, above all in its general character: The section in *Chambers* 'Australia' is written in a very critical manner and focuses strongly on inter-colonial rivalries: 'each [colony was, N.K.] (…) somewhat jealous of the rest and determined to preserve its own territory's trade for

[441] Letter from Robertson on 27 July 1926 to Tucker, NLA: MS 708.
[442] Jose, 'Australia', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 600.
[443] Ibid.
[444] J. O'Halloran, 'Australia', *Chambers* (1908), vol. 1, p. 594.

its own capital.'[445] Jose lists various reasons for these inter-colonial rivalries. His judgement of federation turns out to be amazingly down-to-earth. In his eyes, it was not national feeling that brought the colonies together, but political issues like Chinese immigration and a growing sense of defencelessness. This is a surprisingly modern interpretation of federation.

Even though the author of the article in the *AE* briefly mentions inter-colonial rivalries and does not conceal practical reasons behind federation,[446] he in general concentrates more on the actual political process leading up to federation. The centre of attention are the suggestions of various people involved, the committees established and the history of the bill that finally emerged. The *AE's* 'Federation' is written in a less critical tone than the section in *Chambers*. It does not contain anything like the following scathing assessment contained in *Chambers*:

> *Even so [despite the demands of external policy, N.K.] it took nearly twenty years to reconcile the legislatures to surrendering a part of their powers to some central body; indeed, federation was only achieved by the bold action of a premier who appealed to the electors at large over the head of parliament.*[447]

Jose even wrote that Britain had wanted to introduce 'some form of federation' in the 1850s and that the Australian colonies had rejected these efforts.[448] Hence, the section on federation in *Chambers* was independent from the article 'Federation' in the *AE*. No knowledge transfer can be detected.

Broken Hill

The articles on 'Broken Hill' in *Chambers* and the *AE* both concentrate on the mines, not on the settlement. This was implicit in the nature of the subject, since the settlement of Broken Hill developed as a result of the resources discovered in the area. The geographical and historical descriptions of the mines in the two encyclopaedias are different. For example, *Chambers* says that in the Broken Hill area, a silver lode was discovered in 1883,[449] whereas the *AE* informs its readers that 'chloride of silver was struck' only 'towards the end of 1884'.[450] (In connection with 1883, the *AE* explains: 'In

[445] Jose, 'Australia', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 598.
[446] 'Federation', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 446–447.
[447] Jose, 'Australia', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 598.
[448] Ibid.
[449] Jose, 'Broken Hill', *Chambers*, vol. 2, p. 479.
[450] James Farish Stephen, 'Broken Hill', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 206.

1883 the township of Silverton was surveyed (…) and small quantities of extraordinarily rich silver ore were obtained from a number of shallow narrow lodes.'[451])

Both articles make a scientific impression. The *AE* contains a large amount of technical details on the ore treatment, and *Chambers* offers a scientific description of the nature of the silver mine. Whereas Jose in his description in *Chambers* seems detached from the subject, the *AE* article contains a certain pride. Public buildings and other public services of the settlement are enumerated in the *AE*:

> *It [Broken Hill, N.K.] possesses substantial public buildings, a post office, town hall, theatres, a technical college, libraries, and a well-equipped hospital. Steam trams run to the suburbs, and there are good gas, electric light, and water services.*[452]

The author James Farish Stephen tells his readers proudly that an 'entirely new process was evolved' to separate the different minerals at Broken Hill from one another.[453]

The judgement about the current and the future value of the mines is diametrically opposed in the two articles. *Chambers* gives its audience the impression that the mines are in definitive decline:

> *The yield is, however, now more fluctuating than of old, both because the lode is altering as it descends and because of strikes; indeed, after the conclusion of the war production ceased altogether for some years.*[454]

The *AE* on the other hand does not talk about strikes and reduced production. It does mention that 'as the mine-workings went deeper, and farther away from the original blocks of the Proprietary Company, the ores changed to sulphides of lead and zinc (galena and blende), carrying lower silver values.'[455] However, this does not lead the author to thoughts about decline. He writes that the 'ore developed and available for extraction was estimated by the government geologist in May 1925 at over 13 million tons, with unknown possibilities beyond'.[456]

[451] Ibid.
[452] Ibid. p. 207.
[453] Ibid.
[454] Jose, 'Broken Hill', *Chambers*, vol. 2, p. 479.
[455] Stephen, 'Broken Hill'. *AE*, vol. 1, p. 207.
[456] Ibid.

Alfred Deakin

A letter by David Patrick to Jose reveals that Jose had a certain length in mind for his article on Prime Minister Alfred Deakin, and that Patrick was willing to give him that amount of space: 'I shall make space for the new articles like Deakin to suit your plan of measurement.'[457] The final article in *Chambers* was about three quarters of a column long. The article in the *AE* was a great deal longer, namely three and a half columns. It was not signed, again suggesting that Jose wrote it. Despite the fact that both articles may have been written by the same person, and even though most information included in *Chambers* is present in the *AE* article as well, there are no signs of knowledge transfers between the two works. There is a decisive difference between the two articles: whereas the *AE* article concludes with pointing out Deakin's relevance for the Australian Commonwealth,[458] *Chambers* points out that Deakin was 'set (…) among the foremost statesmen of the empire'.[459] This meant that the focus of the two articles was different. The article in the *AE* clearly focussed on Australia, whereas the article in *Chambers* pointed out the broader context of Deakin as a statesman of the Empire.

Education

It has been established that Jose wrote a section of the article 'Education' for inclusion into *Chambers*, most likely the part on Australian and New Zealand education. This section is about one column long and deals in a brief way with elementary, secondary and tertiary education in New Zealand and Australia. In the *AE* this knowledge is spread over several larger articles: 'Education, Public', 'Schools' and 'Universities'. Concerning the content of the articles, there are no unusual congruences between the *AE* and *Chambers*. There is a striking difference however. Whereas Jose in *Chambers* writes that 'New Zealand differs from the Australian states, inasmuch as its educational administration is not so strictly centralised',[460] Thomas George Tucker in the *AE* article 'Education, Public' describes the education system in Australia as regulated mainly by the individual states.[461] The whole article is very much concerned with individual

[457] Letter from Patrick on 11 April 1912 to Jose, NAA: AWM39, 6.
[458] 'Deakin, Alfred', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 366.
[459] Jose, 'Deakin, Alfred', *Chambers*, vol. 3, p. 716.
[460] Jose, section 'Australia and New Zealand', 'Education', John Adams, *Chambers*, vol. 4, p. 217.
[461] Thomas George Tucker, 'Education, Public', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 397.

developments in the different states, whereas Jose with one column in *Chambers* generalises more.

The judgements made about the Australian education system in *Chambers* and the *AE* are divergent. In the *AE*, Australian education is described in a positive way, admittedly with a strong defensive undertone. It is emphasised again and again that 'every reasonable endeavour has been made' to provide schooling for everybody, also in remote areas, and also for Aboriginal people,[462] and that Australian education is equal with education in Britain. This is especially conspicuous in the last part of the article 'Universities', a kind of addendum to the actual article. This section bears no initials, which once again probably means it was written by Jose. The addendum is a eulogy on Australian university standards, on university staff, on books produced at Australian universities etc. It is pointed out that 'in the last respect [the standards of degrees, N.K.] the Australian universities can compare favourably with any others in the British Empire'.[463] The main part of 'Education' by R.A.D. (not in the *AE's* index) is written in the same defensive tone, making favourable comparisons to famous English universities and pointing out that Australian universities had been approved by the Crown. On the University of Adelaide for instance, it says that

> *in 1881 royal letters patent were issued declaring that the degrees granted by it should be recognized as academic distinctions and be entitled 'to rank, precedence and consideration throughout the British Empire as if granted by any University in the United Kingdom.*[464]

Just as the article on universities, 'Education, Public' and 'Schools' contain various remarks on the equality of Australian education with British education. It seems that these encyclopaedia articles were resisting voices that judged Australian education to be inferior to British counterparts. H.A.T.T., the author of 'Schools' (also not in the index), seems desperate to explain and justify perceived inferiorities in Australia's secondary education at private schools:

> *Theoretically there is no material difference between the educational standards of the Australian schools and those of Great Britain. So far as any advantage is possessed by the latter, it lies in the greater number of specialist scholars available as schoolmasters. To a large extent this is due to the higher emoluments ultimately obtainable in the teaching profession, and to the greater*

[462] See for example: Tucker, 'Education, Public', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 400.
[463] Addendum to: R.A.D., 'Universities', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 608.
[464] R.A.D., 'Universities', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 606–607.

> *difficulty which such scholars there experience in finding avenues to other professions which are more lucrative.*[465]

Even though the *AE* authors are keen to portray the Australian education system in the best possible way, they cannot disengage from their mother country. Their need to continually stress Australia's equality with Britain shows that Australia and Britain could not be disentangled from one another.

In contrast to the articles in the *AE*, the section on Australia and New Zealand in *Chambers* is written in a paternalistic, and at times patronising, tone. In a paragraph dealing with New Zealand, the population of dominions is portrayed as not very intellectual: 'From the nature of the Dominion there is a greater demand for a practical education than for a purely literary one; though, in proportion to the population, higher education is well provided for.'[466] In congruence with this judgement Australian universities are not compared with famous English ones as in the *AE*, but with Scottish ones and 'the provincial English type'.[467] Clearly, Australian education is not regarded to be of equal quality to that in Britain. With a mixture of paternal commendation and condescension Victoria and New South Wales are said to be

> *very proud of their educational systems, but they are keenly alive to the need of keeping abreast with modern developments. All the states take pains to keep themselves in touch with what is going on elsewhere, and their official reports give evidence of extraordinary alertness.*[468]

Thus the description of the Australian education system in *Chambers* is diametrically opposed to the description in the *AE*. This is quite curious considering that Jose had not only written the section in *Chambers*, but most likely also the addendum in the *AE*. Jose had assumed different personalities in connection with the two works, and must have given preference to one of his dual loyalties depending on which encyclopaedia he worked on at the time. It seems that he kept the different audiences of the two encyclopaedias in mind.

3.2.3.2 Other Articles Dealing with Australian Subjects

Were Jose's articles the only Australian articles contained in *Chambers*? In order to answer this question it needs to be determined what was considered to be Australian in

[465] H.A.T.T., 'Schools', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 424.
[466] Jose, section 'Australia and New Zealand', 'Education', John Adams, *Chambers*, vol. 4, p. 217.
[467] Ibid.
[468] Ibid.

the 1920s. The entries in the *AE* can be used as a starting point to solve this problem because, as established earlier, the *AE* included everything that its editors considered to be important for the Australian nation. However, that also involved topics of more general matter that was not exclusively Australian. Some topics cannot be categorised as either 'Australian' or 'not Australian'. It should be safe though to classify the following entries in the *AE* as Australian:

'Aborigines', 'Banksia', 'Boomerangs', 'Bunyip', 'Bushranging', 'Commonwealth Bank', 'Emancipists', 'Eucalyptus', 'Eureka Stockade', 'Federation', 'Fisher, Andrew', 'Grainger, Percy Aldrige', 'Kangaroos and Wallabies', 'Kelly, Edward', 'Kendall, Henry', 'Koala', 'Lalor, Peter', 'Lawson, Henry Archibald', 'Leichhardt, Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig', 'Macadamia', 'Marsupials', 'Melba, Dame Nellie', 'Mount Morgan', 'Parkes, Sir Henry', 'Paterson, Andrew Barton', 'Platypus', 'Roberts, Tom', 'Scott, Rose', 'Spence, Catherine Helen', 'Sydney Harbour Bridge', 'Tasmanian Devil', 'Tasmanian Wolf', 'Torres Straits', 'Trucanini' and 'Wombats'.

One could argue that Andrew Fisher, Peter Lalor, Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig Leichhardt, Sir Henry Parkes, Tom Roberts and Catherine Helen Spence were not Australian-born and therefore should not be included in this list. However, all of these transnational people only became famous after they had emigrated to Australia, and thus all became significant in the Australian context.

Which Australian subjects of the above list appear in *Chambers*? The great majority, 25 of 35 subjects, found a place in the Scottish encyclopaedia. About half of the subjects (17) appear with an individual article,[469] eight were included in other entries.[470]

[469] 'Banksia', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 720. –'Boomerang', vol. 2, pp. 319–320. – 'Bunyip', vol. 2, p. 560. – 'Bushrangers', vol. 2, pp. 590–591. – 'Eucalyptus', vol. 4, pp. 467–468. – 'Fisher, Andrew', vol. 4, p. 673. – 'Kangaroo', vol. 6, pp. 400–401. – 'Kendall, Henry Clarence', vol. 6, p. 421. – 'Koala', vol. 6, p. 467. – 'Lawson, Henry Hertzberg', vol. 6, p. 562. – 'Leichhardt, Ludwig', vol. 6, p. 593. – 'Marsupials', vol. 7, p. 56. – 'Melba, Dame Nellie Porter', vol. 7, p. 122. – (For platypus:) 'Ornithorhynchus', vol. 7, pp. 646–647. – 'Parkes, Sir Henry', vol. 7, p. 769. – 'Torres Strait', vol. 10, pp. 173–174. – 'Wombats', vol. 10, p. 693.

[470] For the Eureka Stockade see: 'Ballarat', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 689. – 'Victoria', vol. 10, p. 422, – For federation see: 'Australia', vol. 1, p. 598. See also: 'Federations and Unions', vol. 4, pp. 595–598. – For Percy Grainger see: 'Australia', vol. 1, p. 600, where the composer is briefly mentioned. – The (empty) article 'Kelly, Ned' refers to 'Bushrangers', vol. 2, p. 591, where the Kelly brothers are mentioned. – For the Sydney Harbour Bridge see: 'Sydney', vol. 9, p. 828, where it is briefly mentioned. The bridge had not been built at the time yet. – For the Tasmanian Devil and the Tasmanian Wolf see 'Dasyures', vol. 3, p. 695, where both are treated. – For Trucanini see: 'Tasmania', vol. 9, p. 876.

Only ten could not be located in the encyclopaedia.[471] A great amount of specifically Australian knowledge had found its way into the general knowledge of *Chambers*.

The relation between the articles in *Chambers* and the corresponding ones in the *AE* is not one of dependency. There is no evidence that the authors of the articles copied from one another. The only similarity between the two encyclopaedias is that both encyclopaedias use the technique of describing Australian animals by comparing them to animals better known in Europe. *Chambers* applies this technique more often. For example it compares the koala with a sloth,[472] the wombat with 'a small bear'[473] and writes about kangaroos that 'they are formidable consumers of pasture; two kangaroos eat as much grass as three sheep'.[474] The *Chambers* articles are in general much shorter than the ones in the *AE*, often contain quite different information and always different illustrations (if there are any). Sometimes the encyclopaedias contradict one another. For Dame Nellie Melba different birth dates are given.[475] The articles on bushranging exhibit contrasting judgements about the matter treated. The *AE* tells its users that the first bushrangers, escaped convicts, 'were compelled to resort to robbery for mere sustenance' and that 'the quality of the crime, apart from the actual absconding, depended on the character of the escapee'.[476] *Chambers* seems less sympathetic. On early bushrangers the reader gets to know that 'their crimes (beyond mere robbery) were deliberate, unnecessary, motived by savagery and revenge'.[477]

The general tone on Australian items is different in the two encyclopaedias. Whereas the *AE* is very precise, describing especially animals and plants in a very detailed and sometimes loving way, *Chambers* is more generalising. This might also have to do with the fact that there was less space for these Australian articles in *Chambers*. The Scottish encyclopaedia also displays a great deal of astonishment about Australian animals and plants, conceived of as strange and peculiar. The articles on the platypus and the kangaroo are perfect examples for this. The anonymous author of the article 'Ornithorhynchus' has still retained the astonishment and surprise of the first Europeans

[471] 'Aborigines', 'Commonwealth Bank', 'Emancipists', 'Lalor, Peter', 'Macademia', 'Mount Morgan', 'Paterson, Andrew Barton', 'Roberts, Tom', 'Scott, Rose', 'Spence, Catherine Helen'.
[472] 'Koala', *Chambers*, vol. 6, p. 467.
[473] 'Wombat', *Chambers*, vol. 10, p. 693.
[474] 'Kangaroo', *Chambers*, vol. 6, p. 401.
[475] *Chambers* indicates 1859, the *AE* 1861. ('Melba, Dame Nellie Porter', *Chambers*, vol. 7, p. 122. – 'Melba, Dame Nellie', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 52.)
[476] 'Bushranging', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 219.
[477] 'Bushrangers', *Chambers*, vol. 2, p. 590.

who encountered a platypus.[478] This is clearly visible in the vocabulary used, such as the repetition of words like 'curious' and 'peculiar'. The author writes that the bill of the platypus is 'provided with curious tactile structures', that 'in the young of both sexes a curious perforated spur, associated with a gland, occurs near the heel' and that the platypus' 'body temperature is peculiarly low'.[479] The author also makes explicit his puzzlement over the animal by saying that 'many of the enigmas about the duckmole's structure and affinities are still unsolved'.[480] This view of the platypus as strange was at the centre of the nineteenth century British conception of Australia as a strange country.[481]

There still remain many questions about the platypus to the present day. The *AE* makes concessions to this fact by using words such as 'possibly' and 'probably', but the article gives a much stronger impression of established knowledge and of higher familiarity with the platypus. The authors (the article is split into two), William Aitchison Haswell and Harry James Burrell, do not use words like 'curious' or 'peculiar'. The writer of the *Chambers* article on the other hand not only expresses astonishment about the platypus, but also shows a certain distance, almost arrogance. It is pointed out again and again that the platypus is a 'lowly mammal'.[482] Adjectives like 'primitive' and 'old fashioned' are also used to describe the platypus.[483] It is characteristic that the information on the platypus in *Chambers* is not given under the entry 'Platypus'. That entry is empty and refers to 'Ornithorhynchus', the scientific, more distanced categorisation of the animal. The *AE* in contrast deals with the platypus under its vernacular name,[484] and explains (in the article 'Monotremes') that 'some of the special peculiarities of monotremes may be regarded as adaptions to environment rather than as either primitive or degenerate'.[485]

The article 'Kangaroo' in *Chambers* is an example of another peculiarity of the encyclopaedia. Like many other Australian articles it makes a connection to Britain: 'The

[478] For perceptions of the platypus (particularly in the nineteenth century) see: Libby Robin, *How a Continent Created a Nation* (University of New South Wales Press, Sydney 2007) pp. 36–38 and 44–55.
[479] 'Ornithorhynchus', *Chambers*, vol. 7, p. 646.
[480] Ibid. p. 647.
[481] Robin, *How a Continent*, p. 37.
[482] 'Ornithorhynchus', *Chambers*, vol. 7, p. 647.
[483] Ibid. pp. 646–647.
[484] 'Ornithorhynchus' is empty and refers to 'Monotremes' and 'Platypus'. ('Ornithorhynchus', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 236.)
[485] William Aitchison Haswell, 'Monotremes', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 140.

kangaroos and wallabies breed freely in the Zoological Gardens at London'.[486] In other articles, the connection to Britain is made when the use of the subject in Britain (and in other countries) is mentioned. In 'Banksia' it says: 'Some of the species are now frequent ornaments of greenhouses in Britain.'[487]

One can hold that even though Australian knowledge had found its way into the general knowledge of a British encyclopaedia, the perspective on the subjects was one of a stranger who had no close connection to the topics presented. The perspective was British rather than Australian.

3.2.3.3 British Articles

Was there an overlapping of knowledge in the two encyclopaedias where the subjects were British? This category must first be defined. *Chambers* cannot be used as an indicator in this matter since it claims to present universal, not British knowledge. The *AE* is better suited to shed light on this question. Its aim to treat topics that were considered to be important for the Australian nation also meant that a large amount of British topics were included. Many British subjects were crucial in the Australian context. Because of their transnational nature, many *AE* entries cannot be put into a single category. But there are subjects treated in the *AE* that are clearly British in origin.[488] Among these, two groups of entries stand out: articles on sport, and entries to do with the church and religion. The *AE* has eight entries on sport in total: 'Cricket', 'Football', 'Golf', 'Lawn Tennis', 'Racing', 'Rowing and Sculling', 'Pugilism' and 'Swimming'.[489] Of these, at least five – 'Cricket', 'Football', 'Golf', 'Lawn Tennis' and 'Rowing and Sculling' – are British in origin. Were there any knowledge transfers between *Chambers* and *AE* concerning these sport topics?

[486] 'Kangaroo', *Chambers*, vol. 6, p. 401.
[487] 'Banksia', *Chambers*, vol. 1, p. 720.
[488] 'Anglican Church', 'Baptists', 'Church of England', 'Colonial Office, the', 'Cricket', 'Friends, Society of', 'Football', 'Golf', 'Governors-General, Governors & Administrators', 'Imperial Conferences', 'Lawn Tennis', 'Methodist Church', 'Presbyterian Church', ('Quakers', is empty, refers to 'Friends, Society of'), 'Rowing and Sculling', 'Salvation Army'. (This list is not meant to be exhaustive.)
[489] 'Tennis' (*AE*, vol. 2, p. 546) is an empty entry but it refers to 'Lawn Tennis' (vol. 1, pp. 724–726). 'Boxing' (vol. 1, p. 196) is empty too and refers to 'Pugilism' (vol. 2, pp. 345–349), and 'Sculling' (vol. 2, p. 433) is empty and refers to 'Rowing and Sculling' (vol. 2, pp. 402–407).

Sport

Again *Chambers* and the *AE* did not copy from one another, but present different knowledge to their users. Keeping with its aim to spread universal knowledge, *Chambers* provides its readers with general information about the sport's origin and how it is played, as well as describing the sport's history from a global, but also British perspective. The *AE* on the other hand, true to its aim of spreading Australian knowledge, only deals with the sport in Australia, generally omitting questions of origin and explanations of rules. An exception is the *AE* article on swimming, which also explains some technical aspects of the sport, namely the 'side-stroke'.[490] This might have to do with fact that swimming was not considered to be a specifically British sport and was therefore more in need of explanation. Interestingly *Chambers* ignores Australian swimming achievements although it mentions, or even praises, Australian sportsmen in other articles.[491]

Chambers genuinely tries to give a universal perspective on the topics treated, but it cannot – and maybe does not want to – deny that it is a British encyclopaedia. Britain is clearly given preference when describing developments in sport. A British focus is also revealed in the usage of the term 'this country', referring to Britain or a part of it.[492] The *AE* keeps an Australian perspective in all of its articles on sport, expressing pride over achievements by Australian athletes and especially over victories against Britain. The vocabulary is telling. This pride is especially evident in the articles on cricket, tennis and swimming. On the Australian swimmer B.B. Keiran the *AE* tells its readers that in the English mile championship,

> *[he, N.K.] met the English champion, David Billington, who defeated him after a great struggle, possibly because he had been only ten days ashore and was therefore not yet fit for a hard race. Keiran afterwards met the best swimmers in Europe (including Billington), and defeated them all easily.*[493]

As this quote shows defeats are not concealed, but the description of victories weighs much more. 'Lawn Tennis' contains similar proud assertions of Australian successes

[490] W.L., 'Swimming', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 519.
[491] F.I. Watson, 'Swimming', *Chambers*, vol. 9, pp. 815–816. See also: Robert H. Lyttelton, 'Cricket', *Chambers*, vol. 3, pp. 558–560. – C.J. Butcher, 'Football', *Chambers*, vol. 4, p. 752. – Guy Campbell, 'Golf', *Chambers*, vol. 5, p. 299. And especially: W. B. Woodgate and Charles M. Pitman, 'Rowing', *Chambers*, vol. 8, p. 815.
[492] Guy Campbell, 'Golf', *Chambers*, vol. 5, p. 299. – Charles Richardson, 'Horse-Racing', *Chambers*, vol. 5, p. 800.
[493] W.L., 'Swimming', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 520.

despite the admission of a strong English influence on the sport in Australia.[494] In 'Cricket' the 'high standard' of the game in Australia is emphasised several times, and victories against England are written about with language bursting of pride.[495] The Australians are said to have 'vanquished the full strength of England'.[496] The article points out that the so-called Currency Club, made up only of native-born Australians, 'in point of skill was far ahead of all its contemporaries'.[497] Once again the fear that the Australian sun and the 'convict' stain might have had a deteriorating effect on the British stock is dispelled. The *AE* refers to the first teams that went and played against England overseas with almost martial vocabulary: 'The success of the Australian players against Lillywhite's team in 1876–7 inspired the cricketers of that period to form a team to invade England.'[498] It is no accident that the articles on cricket and tennis contain particularly strong assertions of Australian success. Tennis and cricket were considered to be especially popular in Australia. According to the *AE* 'the game [lawn tennis, N.K.] has in Australia such a hold now that the sway of cricket is seriously threatened.'[499]

This relish to celebrate victories against England is evidence both of national pride and of continuing dependence on Britain. As Stuart Macintyre puts it: 'The dependence of a people and its polity on sporting triumphs might be taken as a sign of its immaturity.'[500] Graeme Davison coined a specific term in connection with Australia's need to impress its mother country, the 'imaginary grandstand'.[501] It means that Australian sportspeople and their supporters always have had an audience in mind whom they are trying to impress. For a long time this audience consisted to a large extent of British spectators. In the entry on cricket, just as in the article on education, it is pointed out that Australian cricket was just as highly developed as in the mother country. Contests between New South Wales and Victoria are said to be 'without parallel in Australia, and equalled only in the annual meetings of the rival roses – Lancashire and Yorkshire – in England.'[502] Commenting on

[494] Robert Matthew Kidston, 'Lawn Tennis', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 725.
[495] Leslie Oswald Sheridan Poidevin and J.C. Davis, 'Cricket', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 329 and 331.
[496] Ibid. p. 334.
[497] Ibid. p. 329.
[498] Ibid. p. 333.
[499] Robert Matthew Kidston, 'Lawn Tennis', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 725.
[500] Stuart Macintyre, 'Prologue: Sport and Past Australasian Culture', *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*, J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.) (Frank Cass, London and Portland, Or. 2000) p. 7.
[501] Graeme Davison, 'The Imaginary Grandstand', pp. 12–26.
[502] Poidevin and Davis, 'Cricket', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 330.

the scores of a match between England and Australia, the author declares that 'it has long been realized that the pupil has become as proficient as the master'.[503]

In the article on football – another one with a strong Australian orientation – the Australian outlook is briefly lost. In the first paragraph of the part 'International Football', the impersonal formulation 'were won' refers to the British rather than the Australians: 'In 1888 the first British team under Rugby rules visited Australia; of nine games played in New South Wales seven were won and two drawn (against The King's School and the Sydney Grammar School).'[504] Later in the article, the Australian perspective is picked up again, when the author writes about the first tour of Australian footballers in England and America: 'Thirty-one matches in all were played, of which only five were lost (those against Llanelly, Midlands, Wales, Swansea, and Cardiff).'[505]

Alongside nationalism and admiration of the mother country there is also a display of intercolonial competition. The *AE* contains more lists of game results between the different colonies than between England and Australia.[506] It is interesting that although the *AE* in general deals with all Australian colonies, New South Wales is treated more thoroughly than the other colonies.

Curiously, the *AE* does not contain an article on surf life-saving. Even though this sport had British roots, as Sean Brawley has shown, surf culture by the 1920s had become a distinctive part of Australian culture, and it was regarded as such at the time.[507] The surf medallion of the Surf Bathing Association of NSW (SBA) was more highly valued than the equivalent certificate from the London-based Royal Life Saving Society (RLSS).[508] This would have been perfect material for the nationalist *AE*, but it is only dealt with very briefly in the article on swimming. The article does not acknowledge the achievements of the SBA, but refers to the qualifications that the RLSS provided, thus concealing the rivalry between the two associations:

---

[503] Ibid. p. 335.
[504] John Verner Cunningham-Browne, 'Football', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 479.
[505] Ibid.
[506] See: 'Poidevin and Davis, 'Cricket', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 329 and 330. – Cunningham-Browne, 'Football', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 478 and 479. – Thomas Tombleson, 'Golf', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 562. – Kidston, 'Lawn Tennis', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 724. – John Verner Cunningham-Browne, 'Rowing', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 403 and 405.
[507] Sean Brawley, '"Our Life-Savers": The Royal Life Saving Society and the Origins of Surf Life Saving in Federation Sydney', *Sport, Federation, Nation*, Richard Cashman et al. (eds.) (Walla Walla Press, Sydney 2001) pp. 139–164, especially pp. 155–156.
[508] Brawley, '"Our Live-Savers"', p. 155.

> *In every State there exists a branch of the Royal Life Saving Society, which holds instruction classes in life-saving; to swimmers who pass certain tests a certificate or medal is given. The surf life-saving clubs, Royal Life Saving Society, and swimming associations work together.*[509]

It seems that Angus & Robertson had missed an opportunity to serve the *AE's* nationalist purpose. Including a full article on surf life-saving and praising the achievements of the SBA could have represented another part in the encyclopaedia's national mind-map. That the encyclopaedists did not seize this chance shows once again that the *AE* despite its nationalist nature could not deny its British input.

Church and Religion

The *AE* contains nine articles dealing with church or religion: 'Baptists', 'Benedictine Order, the, in Australia', 'Church of England', 'Friends, Society of', 'Jews', 'Methodist Church', 'Presbyterian Church', 'Roman Catholic Church' and 'Seventh Day Adventists'.[510] None of these churches were founded in Australia. The majority ('Baptists', 'Church of England', 'Friends, Society of', 'Methodist Church', 'Presbyterian Church') originated in Britain. There are no knowledge transfers to be detected between these articles and the corresponding ones in *Chambers*.[511] The pattern of differences between the two encyclopaedias is the same as with the sports entries. *Chambers* deals with the churches in general, traces their origins and explains the religious beliefs associated with them. It follows the development of the churches in general, but puts special emphasis on their history in Britain. Australia is mentioned occasionally, but only briefly.[512] In contrast, the *AE* again focuses on Australia. The lemma for the Benedictine Order ('Benedictine Order, the, in Australia') indicates that Australia is the centre of interest. The *AE* does not explain the content of the beliefs or the origin of the churches

[509] W.L., 'Swimming', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 519.
[510] William Higlett, 'Baptists', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 130–133. – Eris M. O'Brien, 'Benedictine Order, the, in Australia', vol. 1, p. 155. – John Verner Cunningham-Browne, 'Church of England', vol. 1, pp. 262– 269. – William Benson, 'Friends, Society of', vol. 1, p. 491. – 'Jews', vol. 1, pp. 684–685. – James Colwell, 'Methodist Church', vol. 2, pp. 69–71. – W.A.S.A., 'Presbyterian Church', vol. 2, pp. 326–332. – Eris M. O'Brien, 'Roman Catholic Church', vol. 2, pp. 395–399. – Albert William Anderson, 'Seventh Day Adventists', vol. 2, pp. 445–446. The articles 'Anglican Church' (vol. 1, 59), 'Quakers' (vol. 2, p. 350) and 'Wesleyans' (vol. 2, p. 653) are empty and refer to other articles ('Anglican Church' to 'Church of England'; 'Quakers' to 'Friends, Society of', and 'Wesleyans' to 'Methodist Church'.)
[511] John Clifford, 'Baptists', vol. 1, pp. 726– 728. – E.G. Cody, 'Benedictines', vol. 2, pp. 73–74. – The Church of England is dealt with in: 'Church History', vol. 3, pp. 235–242. – James G. Smeal, 'Friends, the Society of', vol. 5, pp. 10–13. – Emm. Deutsch et al., 'Jews', vol. 6, pp. 330–341. – John Telford, 'Methodism', vol. 7, pp. 157–160. – 'Presbyterianism', vol. 8, pp. 369–371. – 'Roman Catholic Church', vol. 8, pp. 751–755. – Seventh Day Adventists are included in: 'Sabbath', vol. 8, pp. 864–868.
[512] The article 'Australia' in *Chambers* analysed above also contains a section on religion. However, it is very short and does not suggest any knowledge transfers between *Chambers* and the *AE*.

and concentrates on aspects such as organization, infrastructure and education. The only exception is the article 'Seventh-day Adventists' where the American origin of the denomination is set forth at the beginning of the entry.[513]

3.2.3.4 Transnational Articles

As indicated above some articles in the *AE* cannot be labelled with a definitive tag such as 'Australian' or 'British'. This is particularly true for many of the biographical articles. Even though we have established that the *AE* only includes people who had a special relation to the Australian nation, many of these people had other national affiliations too. It would be more appropriate to call them 'transnationals'. These transnationals can be divided into two groups: people who could be described as transnationals because their lives stretched beyond national boundaries, and people whose deeds and achievements were of transnational importance. Some people might fit both categories.

The transnational character of biographical entries is not confined to Australia and Britain, but an Australian-British transnationalism is of special importance in the context of *Chambers* and the *AE*. Many transnationals in the *AE* are also listed in *Chambers*, examples being James Cook, scientist and traveller Johann Reinhold Forster, novelist Henry Kingsley, explorer Sir William Edward Parry and biologist and anthropologist Sir Walter Baldwin Spencer (who also contributed articles to the *AE*). Cook, Kingsley, Parry and Spencer were all English-born, but travelled to Australia – and in the case of Kingsley, Parry and Spencer – lived and worked there for extended periods of time.[514] Forster was German from Polish Prussia and became Cook's principal naturalist on the HMS Resolution.[515] As the entries in *AE* and *Chambers* show, all of these people were considered to be important for an Australian, as well as a more general context.

No knowledge transfers between the two sets of articles occur. Since both encyclopaedias treat the same subjects, some information is inevitably the same. The articles in the *AE* are much more detailed. A great deal of the knowledge presented is

[513] Anderson, 'Seventh Day Adventists', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 445.
[514] For Kingsley see: J.S.D. Mellick, *The Passing Guest: A Life of Henry Kingsley* (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia et al. 1983) pp. 1 and 44. – For Spencer see: D.J. Mulvaney and J.H. Calaby, '*So Much That Is New*'. *Baldwin Spencer, 1860–1929: A Biography* (University of Melbourne Press, Melbourne 1985) pp. 9–13 and 75.
[515] Michael E. Hoare (ed.), *The Resolution Journal of Johann Reinhold Forster 1772–1775*, vol. 1 (Hakluyt Society, London 1982) pp. 1–2.

different, be it the choice of information or the judgements of the person treated. For example, the birth dates for James Cook and Johann Reinhold Forster's son are different,[516] and the encyclopaedias come to very different conclusions about the value of Henry Kingsley's writings. *Chambers* is not very enthusiastic about the novelist: 'His best novels are manly, pathetic, strong, yet full of improbabilities, and written in a somewhat undistinguished style.'[517] The *AE* knows several reasons why one should appreciate Kingsley's work:

> *Henry Kingsley's writings, while less popular than those of his brother Charles, are by good critics ranked above them. In* Geoffry Hamlyn *he preserved a valuable record of the golden age of squatterdom, before the gold discoveries brought in an excitable and cosmopolitan crowd – and the record is contemporaneous, for no swarms from the Ballarat ant-heap had during the fifties found their way south of Skipton. Kingsley's work is a useful reminder that the settlement of Australian is not entirely bound up with convicts and drought-maimed explorers and the constitutional troubles of New South Wales governors.*[518]

The author of the *AE* article liked Kingsley because – according to him – he did not portray politically sensitive issues such as convicts, but 'the golden age of squatterdom', showing Australia in a favourable light. This is a general trait of the biographical articles in the *AE*. All of the transnational articles, except the one on Cook, are keenly pointing out the significance of the person for the Australian nation. On Baldwin Spencer, the *AE* reports:

> *In 1912 he acted as special commissioner and chief protector of aborigines for the Commonwealth government; his report,* The Native Tribes of the Northern Territory, *made valuable suggestions with regard to the future treatment of the aborigines.*[519]

Whereas the *AE* also tells its users about William Edward Parry's work as a commissioner for the Australian Agricultural Company and mentions that some of the drawings of Johann Reinhold Forster's son (who accompanied his father on the Resolution) were now kept in the Australian Museum in Sydney, the producers of *Chambers* did not seem to find these parts of the biographies important.[520]

---

[516] See: Francis Joseph Bayldon, 'Cook, James', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 304. – 'Cook, James', *Chambers*, vol. 3, p. 447. – 'Forster, Johann Reinhold', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 484. – 'Forster, Johann Reinhold', *Chambers*, vol. 4, p. 770.
[517] 'Kingsley, Henry', *Chambers*, vol. 6, p. 451.
[518] 'Kingsley, Henry', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 701.
[519] John Verner Cunningham-Browne, 'Spencer, Sir Walter Baldwin', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 489.
[520] See: ' Parry, Sir William Edward', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 271. And: 'Parry, Sir William Edward', *Chambers*, vol. 7, p. 781. – 'Forster, Johann Reinhold', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 484. And: 'Forster, Johann Reinhold', *Chambers*, vol. 4, p. 770.

The *AE* article on Cook does not possess a particularly Australian perspective. The only indication that Cook was considered important for the Australian nation is the mentioning of Australian memorial sites for Cook.[521] But allowing for the great significance of Cook for the Australian nation, maybe the author Francis Joseph Bayldon thought that Cook's significance was obvious.

3.3 Conclusion

The *AE* was planned and presented as a genuine, independent national work, representing a portrait of the young Australian nation. The producers of the *AE*, above all Jose and Robertson, aimed to support the consolidation of the Australian nation, internally – i.e. within Australia – as well as externally – i.e. the rest of the world and particularly Britain. It was principally for marketing reasons that *Chambers* was used as a model for the *AE*, with Robertson hoping it would sell better if it was advertised as a supplement to *Chambers*. Therefore special prices were offered for customers acquiring the *AE* when purchasing *Chambers*. The model function of *Chambers* thus had little to do with ideological reasons, aside from Robertson's love for his native country.

With one exception no knowledge transfers could be detected between the two encyclopaedias. Many articles in the encyclopaedias are diametrically opposed to one another, especially in their tone. Using a large amount of primary sources and creating their own illustrations, Angus & Robertson were exceptional in their approach. Most national encyclopaedias of the twentieth century relied heavily on copying from one another.[522] The articles in the *AE* display a loving familiarity with the Australian environment, Australian national pride and a strong interest in nation building. In contrast, Australian articles in *Chambers* were matter-of-fact, and occasionally patronising or critical. The perspective in *Chambers* is British, despite its claim on universal knowledge. Thus *Chambers* remained true to its genre, the Konversationslexikon, which is constructed according to its audience's needs. For *Chambers'* British audience, British-oriented knowledge must have been more useful than general knowledge.

As Jose in many cases was responsible for the articles in both encyclopaedias, these differences are rather surprising. It seems that he had two audiences in mind, giving

[521] Bayldon, 'Cook, James', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 307.
[522] Gluck, 'The Fine Folly', p. 43.

preference to one of his dual loyalties depending on which encyclopaedia he worked on at the time.

Despite the differences between the two encyclopaedias, some links are conspicuous. Jose was truly a transnational person, with loyalties to two imagined communities, his life stretching across two continents. Through him, the productions of Australian and British general knowledge were entangled. Jose brought an Australian perspective to *Chambers* articles that before had none, and some advice given by W&R Chambers was taken up gratefully by Angus & Robertson.

The two encyclopaedias are also connected through the general entanglement of British and Australian affairs at the time. Despite the effort to produce something new, Angus & Robertson could not, and probably did not want to free themselves from British influence in the *AE*. This is visible in several ways. (1) Some of the topics that were considered to be important for the Australian nation were of British origin; (2) Australia was continuously compared with Britain; (3) and Australian topics such as life-saving were British-influenced. Australian knowledge production also had an influence on Britain. *Chambers'* perspective on Australian subjects was one of a stranger, but the fact that a great deal of Australian knowledge was included in *Chambers* remains significant. Australian knowledge was made into general knowledge.

Concerning articles that were originally not Australian in nature, the *AE* could be described as supplementing *Chambers*. *Chambers* delivers general and British knowledge, the *AE* adds a particular Australian perspective. General definitions were less important for the *AE*, that, typical of Konversationslexika, was mainly about establishing a link to concrete experiences of its Australian audience. If a user of the *AE* could not relate to these experiences, for example not being Australian, he or she could still consult *Chambers* for a more general context.

The supplementing nature of the *AE* is not consistent however, with a large number of articles in the *AE*, particularly on Australian topics, rivalling the articles in *Chambers*. Angus & Robertson regarded it necessary to include articles on banksias, platypi or bushrangers, even though *Chambers* treated these as well. The *AE* not only acted as a Konversationslexikon, but also as a monument for the developing Australian nation. Angus & Robertson had thus used an established genre from the old world – the

Konversationslexikon – and had given it an additional, new meaning. The missing architectural monuments for the Australian nation were made up for by a textual one.

4 Stages in Australian Nation Building

Having established that the *AE* was intended to be a nation building tool and a monument for the Australian nation, the question arises whether this way of presenting general knowledge only developed after the 1880s, i.e. after the time which – according to most modern historians – first saw the emergence of political and cultural nationalism in Australia. Was the way the *AE* presented general knowledge new? And if so what was new? A comparison of the *AE* with an earlier Australian encyclopaedia will shed light on these questions.[523]

Before the publication of the *AE* three other encyclopaedic works with an Australian or Australasian focus were produced in Australia. Only one of them was called a *Cyclopaedia*, namely David Blair's *Cyclopaedia of Australasia*.[524] John Henniker Heaton's *Australian Dictionary of Dates and Men of the Time* and Andrew Garran's *Picturesque Atlas of Australasia* can also be classified as encyclopaedias since they correspond to the encyclopaedic principle.[525] Garran's *Atlas*, although divided into chapters rather than entries, was most likely not made to be read fully. The format of the work – three very large and heavy volumes – suggests that the *Atlas* was made for consultation. *Cole's Commonwealth Handbook and Almanac for 1905* on the other hand, a work that in the subtitle was called encyclopaedia, lacks an important core characteristic of encyclopaedias: it does not claim to be complete. Its introduction clearly states that the work compiles 'some particulars' of the Australian colonies, giving '*only* extracts' (of other sources).[526] Heaton's *Dictionary* was thus the first Australian encyclopaedia produced in Australia, and since it was published in 1879, it is ideal for a comparison with the *AE*.

Sir John Henniker Heaton (1848–1914) is today mainly remembered as a postal reformer.[527] He fought for a long time for cheaper postal and telegraphic charges, with

[523] 'Australian' meaning: produced in Australia, having an Australian focus.
[524] David Blair, *Cyclopaedia of Australasia, or, Dictionary of Facts, Events, Dates, Persons, and Places Connected with the Discovery, Exploration, and Progress of the British Dominions in the South, from the Earliest Dawn of Discovery in the Southern Ocean to the Year 1881* (Ferguson and Moore, Melbourne 1881).
[525] Heaton, *Dictionary*. – Andrew Garran (ed.), *Picturesque Atlas of Australasia* (The Picturesque Atlas Publishing Company, Sydney 1886–88).
[526] 'Preface', E. W. Cole, *Cole's Commonwealth Handbook and Almanac for 1905: an Encyclopaedia of Figures and Facts about Australia* (E.W. Cole, Melbourne 1905) p. 2.
[527] The only sources on John Henniker Heaton's life are – ironically – an encyclopaedia (the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*), a biography by Heaton's daughter (published in 1916) and an article from *The World* of 1890. See: B.K. de Garis, 'Heaton, Sir John Henniker (1848–1914)', *Australian Dictionary of*

final success. In 1898 penny postage was introduced in the whole of the former British Empire except Australia, where penny postage was only introduced in 1911. However, postal reform was only one part of Heaton's life. Born in Rochester in England he came to Australia as a very young man. He emigrated to New South Wales as a sixteen year old and worked as a jackaroo before taking up journalism. He worked for several different papers such as the *Cumberland Mercury*, *The Goulburn Evening Penny Post*, the *Cumberland Times* and the Sydney weekly *Australian Town and Country Journal*. For about a year, Heaton held the position of town clerk of Parramatta. In 1873 Heaton married a local woman, Rose Bennett, with whom he settled in Sydney where they lived for ten years.

In 1884 the family moved to London where Heaton became a conservative member in the House of Commons for Canterbury, but he maintained close ties with Australia for the rest of his life. According to his daughter Rose Henniker Porter, Heaton travelled to Australia at least thirty times.[528] Porter recalls her father's affection for Australia and his trust in the country's future:

> *Throughout his life H.H. preserved a feeling of gratitude to Australia, which found a reflection in the warm welcome he gave all Australians visiting England.*
>
> *He had a passionate belief in the future of Australia and the vigorous manhood that was inherent in her sons.*[529]

Heaton acted as a commissioner for New South Wales at the 1886 Indian and Colonial Exhibition in London, just as he had earlier at the Amsterdam Exhibition. Heaton's devotion to Australia earned him the nickname 'the Member for Australia' in the English press, a sobriquet that according to the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* 'was resented and ridiculed by Australian radicals and nationalists'.[530] But an article published in *The World* in 1890 suggests that Heaton had 'come to be regarded by the press of every country as the greatest authority living on the history, geography, and resources of

---

Biography (Australian National University, online edition 2006). (www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A040421b.htm, accessed 25 September 2006.) – Rose Henniker Porter, *The Life and Letters of Sir John Henniker Heaton* (John Lane, London and New York 1916). – 'Celebrities at Home, Mr J. Henniker Heaton, M.P. in Eaton Square', *The World*, 26 February 1890.

[528] Porter, *Heaton*, p. 71.

[529] Ibid. p. 169.

[530] De Garis, 'Heaton'.

Australia.' According to the same article Heaton possessed 3,700 books on Australia or by Australians.[531]

Heaton's love for Australia clearly needs to be seen in an imperial context, just like Jose's passion for the Australian nation a few decades later. Heaton never wished Australia to cut its ties with Britain.[532] One great aim of his struggle for postal reform was to bring the Empire closer together. A quote by Heaton cited in his daughter's biography, mirrors this aim clearly:

> *I shall not regard my work as completed until time and space have been annihilated and the scattered coasts of the Empire have been so united that we can speak to the people of New Zealand as easily as I am speaking to this company.*[533]

Heaton's passion for the prosperity of the British Empire also shows in the London edition of his *Dictionary*. The encyclopaedia is dedicated to the Duke of Manchester and the Council of the Royal Colonial Institute, with the words 'dedicated by one of its Fellows, to commemorate the prominent part taken by the Institute in the promotion of the permanent union between the Mother country and her Colonies, and in the furtherance of the best interests of every portion of the British Empire.'[534] Just like Jose, Heaton had dual loyalties. According to the author of the article in *The World*, Heaton thought that it was 'possible [in England, N.K.], while not loving the dear Old Country less, to love Australia more.'[535]

Heaton compiled his *Dictionary* while he lived in Australia. It seems to have been a one-man enterprise. According to Heaton himself it had taken him 'six years of continuous labour' to finish the task.[536] The *Dictionary* was published in Sydney by George Robertson of Melbourne, and shortly afterwards also by S.W. Silver & Co. in London. Heaton's Australian publisher, Scottish-born Robertson (1825–1898), had migrated to Australia in 1852 where he had become probably the most famous bookseller of his time. He had first opened a bookshop in Melbourne and later expanded his business to Sydney (where he employed George Robertson of later Angus & Robertson), Adelaide, Brisbane and London. Robertson was also 'the first Australian to publish books on a big

[531] 'Celebrities at Home'.
[532] De Garis, 'Heaton'.
[533] John Henniker Heaton on 20 December 1912 quoted in: Porter, *Heaton*, photo page.
[534] John Henniker Heaton, dedication in the *Australian Dictionary of Dates and Men of the Time* (S.W. Silver & Co., London 1879).
[535] John Henniker Heaton quoted in: 'Celebrities at Home'.
[536] Heaton, 'Preface', *Dictionary*, part 1.

and systematic basis'.[537] John Holroyd in his biography of George Robertson wrote: 'George Robertson of Melbourne was a giant in his day who raised the reading standards of the people of Australia and New Zealand.' But there is no evidence that George Robertson of Melbourne was involved in the actual production of the *Dictionary*. As Holroyd remarks, Robertson's personal and business records were not saved for posterity.[538]

Heaton's printer on the other hand, nobody less than the government printer, intervened in *Dictionary* matters. He censored Heaton's *Dictionary*. The printing of the book turned into a full-blown scandal involving members of the New South Wales government of the highest level. After the government printer had printed the manuscript, Heaton was supposed to pay the costs. But Heaton was not happy with the result and wrote a letter of complaint to the printer.[539] His complaint consisted of seven separate points. A few of these dealt with the costs that had been charged to him and which he considered to be too high. But Heaton also made the accusation that

> *certain portions of the manuscript were stolen from the Government Printing Office by Government servants or some person in communication with one or more of them, of which use was made to the serious damage of the reputation of the book and its sale.*[540]

Heaton complained that 'the Government struck out of the book a large portion of what was not *objectionable* matter without my permission' and that 'the Government refused to put their usual imprint to the book, although in all previous cases this imprint has not been withheld.'[541] The government printer admitted that he had made some changes to the manuscript and that his reading staff had made some corrections too, but he also claimed that he 'never struck out anything without consulting Mr. Heaton' and that Heaton 'finally revised every proof, and marked the sheets for press.'[542] The parts of the *Dictionary* in question were the entries 'Prize Fights', 'Cock Fighting', 'Pure Merinos', 'Cornstalks' and 'Currency Lads and Currency Lasses'. The part of the manuscript that had disappeared from the government printer's office and that Heaton claimed was stolen

[537] John Holroyd, *George Robertson of Melbourne 1825–1898: Pioneer Bookseller & Publisher* (Robertson & Mullens, Melbourne 1968) p. 43.
[538] Holroyd, *George Robertson*, p. 7.
[539] Letter from Heaton on 5 June 1879 to the government printer Thomas Richards, ML: Q 655.52/N, part I, no. 4.
[540] Ibid.
[541] Ibid.
[542] Letter from Richards on 13 June 1879 to The Undersecretary for Finance and Trade, ML: Q 655.52/N, part 1, no. 5,

was a list of prize fights. The government printer had decided not to print these sections, and according to him

> *Mr. Heaton strongly resisted the expunging of the list of Prize Fights, and after I struck it out he requested me to print 100 copies in separate form. This I had done accordingly; but, when I learned from Mr. Heaton that he intended to insert the list in the book for certain subscribers, I refused to deliver the separate copies, and afterwards destroyed them, with the exception of two copies which I gave to Mr. Heaton.*[543]

Finally the list with prize fights ended up in the hands of Lewis Scott, a government clerk. Heaton was enraged. A great deal of correspondence about who had given Scott these documents ensued between Heaton and members of the New South Wales government, even involving the Attorney General. The matter does not seem to have been resolved. Whereas Scott maintained that he had received the documents from a certain Mr. Joseph G. O'Connor, who allegedly had nothing to do with the government,[544] Heaton adhered to his claim that the documents had been given to Scott by a government officer.[545] In any case, the New South Wales government evidently had censored Heaton's *Dictionary* and was very intent on retaining certain sections, above all the one on prize fights. Heaton on the other hand insisted on having these sections included in his *Dictionary*. The government won the struggle: there is no entry on prize fights in the *Dictionary* and the term is nowhere mentioned in the *Dictionary*. 'Cock Fighting' and 'Pure Merinos' are missing too.[546] It is impossible to know what the government had so strongly objected to. Concerning some of the other topics in question – 'Cornstalks' and 'Currency Lads and Currency Lasses' – the case is similar. We do not know what exactly the government printer had deleted.

The government printer did explain though to the Undersecretary for Finance and Trade what had apparently been his objections to Heaton's entries 'Cornstalks' and 'Currency Lads and Currency Lasses'. He disliked that 'it was stated that the natives of the Colony were so designated [cornstalks, N.K.] in allusion to their "tall, lank, and bony appearance"' and that in the entry on 'Currency Lads and Currency Lasses' 'the natives

[543] Note of Richards after receiving a letter from Heaton (2 June 1879), ML: Q 655.52/N, part II, no. 1.
[544] See: Mr. Scott's statement, ML: Q 655.52/N, part II, no. 1. – Mr. Scott, with reference to the Attorney General's minute, ML: Q 655.52/N, part II, no. 4.
[545] Letter from Heaton on 26 June 1879 to The Undersecretary for Finance and Trade, ML: Q 655.52/N, part 'further correspondence'.
[546] The *Dictionary* contains the entries 'Bull-Baiting', which includes cock fighting, and 'Sheep', but there are no entries on 'Cock Fighting' or 'Pure Merinos' or 'Merinos'. (See: Heaton, 'Bull-Baiting', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 44. – Heaton, 'Sheep', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 256–257.)

were compared unfavourably with the immigrants, the latter being designated "Sterling."'[547] In the entry 'Cornstalk' the term was ultimately not explained, but said to be 'applied in New South Wales long ago to colonial-born youths'.[548] The statement on 'Currency Lads and Currency Lasses' was most likely weakened by stating that the term was only 'formerly applied'.[549]

It cannot be determined whether it had only been these kinds of statements that the government printer had disliked or whether there had been something more to the story. However, the given explanation does hint at why Heaton's *Dictionary* might have undergone censorship by the government. The government printer disapproved of any suggestion that people born in the colonies were inferior to new immigrants. Was there perhaps a fear that Heaton's *Dictionary* might not show the Australian colonies in the best possible light? This would suggest that the government was well aware of encyclopaedic soft power.

Despite all of this, Heaton felt passionate about his adopted country. He finishes the *Dictionary* by quoting '*a prophecy, written by* DR. ERASMUS DARWIN, *about* A.D. 1790', which predicted that 'Sydney Cove' would become a prosperous place where joy, peace, art and labour were to be found:

> *Where Sydney Cove her lucid bosom swells,*
>
> *Courts her young navies, and the storm repels;*
>
> *High on a rock amid the troubled air*
>
> *HOPE stood sublime, and wav'd her golden hair;*
>
> *Calm'd with her rosy smile the tossing deep,*
>
> *And with sweet accents charm'd the winds to sleep;*
>
> *To each wild plain she stretched her snowy hand,*
>
> *High-waving wood, and sea-encircled strand.*
>
> *'Hear me,' she cried, 'ye rising Realms! record*
>
> *Time's opening scenes, and Truth's unerring word:—*
>
> There *shall be broad streets their stately walls extend,*

[547] Letter from Richards on 13 June 1879 to The Undersecretary for Finance and Trade, ML: Q 655.52/N, part 1, no. 5.
[548] Heaton, 'Cornstalks', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 73.
[549] Heaton, 'Currency Lads and Currency Lasses', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 84.

The circus widen, and the crescent bend;

There, *ray'd from cities o'er the cultur'd land,*

Shall bright canals, and solid roads expand:

There, *the proud arch, Colossus-like, bestride*

Yon glittering streams, and bound the chasing tide;

Embellish'd villas crown the landscape scene,

Farms wave with gold, and orchards blush between.

There shall tall spires, and dome-capt towers ascend,

And piers and quays their massy structures blend;

While with each breeze approaching vessels glide,

And northern treasures dance on every tide!'—

Then ceas'd the nymph — tumultuous echos roar,

And JOY'S load voice was heard from shore to shore —

Her graceful steps descending press'd the plain,

And PEACE, and ART, and LABOUR, join'd her train![550]

This poem displays the same spirit as another poem, quoted under the *Dictionary*'s entry 'Prize Poems'. 'Australasia' by William Charles Wentworth is a solemn praise of Australasia and its future to come, attempting to imitate classic Greek poetry, finishing off with the phrase 'A new Britannia in another world!'.[551] Although the poem is titled 'Australasia' it is dealing with Australia. According to his daughter, Heaton had also quoted this poem in a speech he gave in England. Heaton's liking of the poem not only demonstrates what his daughter calls a 'passionate belief in the future of Australia', but also once again hints at his passion for the British Empire. [552]

4.1 Positive and Negative Lemmata

Heaton's *Dictionary* consists of one volume, divided into two parts, 'Men of the Time' and 'Dictionary of Dates'. In the preface to the *Dictionary* Heaton writes that his work was geared to the tradition of 'its great English prototype'[553], alluding to Joseph

[550] Erasmus Darwin, 'A prophecy', quoted in the *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 317 (Finis).
[551] William Charles Wentworth, 'Australasia', quoted in (Heaton) 'Prize Poems', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 223–226.
[552] See: Porter, *Heaton*, p. 169.
[553] Heaton, 'Preface', *Dictionary*, part 1.

Haydn's *Dictionary of Dates and Universal Information*, first published in 1841.[554] Heaton combined this *Dictionary of Dates* with another established prototype, namely the *Men of the Time*, an encyclopaedia of biographical articles. Hence Heaton's *Dictionary* stood in an entirely different tradition than the *AE*, namely the encyclopaedic dictionary. Haydn's *Dictionary* proved itself to be very popular. It went through 25 editions and 'and when it finally went out of print in 1910 it still remained on library shelves until, nearly sixty years later in 1969, it was reissued by Dover Books'.[555] Heaton's *Dictionary* proved similarly successful. In 1890 it earned the title 'the acknowledged standard work on Australia' in *The World*,[556] and in the twentieth century it was considered to be worth a republication: Angus & Robertson published a new edition of the *Dictionary* in 1984 under the title *The Bedside Book of Colonial Doings*.[557] Considering the popularity of Haydn's and Heaton's works it is surprising that so far they have been neglected in the historiography of encyclopaedias.

The preface of Heaton's *Dictionary* indicates that the work was to cover much more than biographical and historical information. Even though the *Dictionary* is described as attempting to 'embody in a lasting form a digested summary of every branch of Australian history', Heaton also writes that 'it is confidently hoped that the following pages will be found to contain something far more valuable than a mere "Dictionary of Dates," preserving, as they do, innumerable facts of interest and importance'.[558] The second part of Heaton's *Dictionary*, the 'Dictionary of Dates', is accordingly not restricted to historical events, but covers a comprehensive body of general knowledge to do with Australia. The articles in the second part of the *Dictionary* do conclude with the statement of an exact date (or at least of a year). Heaton seems to have been obsessed with numbers and information that could be contained in lists.

B.K. de Garis explains that Heaton's *Dictionary* was 'marred by many inaccuracies'.[559] Indeed the work exhibits a great deal of peculiarities. Some 'empty' lemmata – not containing an actual article but referring to other lemmata – refer to entries

[554] Joseph Haydn, *Dictionary of Dates, and Universal Reference, Relating to All Ages and Nations, with Copious Details of England, Scotland, and Ireland, etc.* (E. Moxon, London 1841).
[555] Robin Myers, 'Joseph Timothy Haydn, of *Dictionary of Dates* Fame: "A long and Laborious Life, Writing Chiefly for the Publishers"', *The British Library Journal*, 5 (2), 1979, p. 173.
[556] 'Celebrities at Home'.
[557] John Henniker Heaton, *The Bedside Book of Colonial Doings*, new edn. (Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1984).
[558] Heaton, 'Preface', *Dictionary*.
[559] De Garis, 'Heaton'.

that do not deal with the subject of the empty lemma. The entry 'Humphreys' in the second part of the *Dictionary* refers to 'Magistrates' and 'Police', entries that do not mention anyone by the name of 'Humphreys'. (Nor does the entry 'Police Magistrate' mention 'Humphreys'.)[560] The article 'Melbourne' does not include any information on 'Queenscliff', even though an empty entry on the subject suggests just that.[561]

Some entries are not what they promise to be in the lemma. The entry 'Samoa' does not provide the reader with any knowledge about the islands, but records that an American colonel was arrested by a Captain Stevens on Samoa on the 28 February 1876 and that a fight with Samoans resulted from it.[562] Some of the knowledge given under certain lemmata seems random. Looking up the entry 'Cold' a user of the *Dictionary* gets to know that 'the temperature at Kiandra, N.S.W., was 8° below zero, Aug. 12, 1872.'[563] The article 'Presentation' tells its readers that 'a silver tea and coffee service and a purse of sovereigns (total value £2,000)' was presented to Hon. J. S. Parnell by the people of New South Wales on 22 January 1876.[564] Were people looking up 'Cold' and 'Presentation' really looking for this kind of knowledge? One could argue that with this quirkiness the *Dictionary* went against an encyclopaedic core characteristic: *consulting* the *Dictionary* probably did not lead to the knowledge desired. However, *reading* the *Dictionary in full* might not have revealed the sought knowledge either, and because encyclopaedias are defined through the principle of family-likeness, a missing characteristic does not necessarily signify a dismissal of the genre. In any case, *The Times* still judged the *Dictionary* as useful. The journalist wrote: 'It is a creditable and useful, and, we believe, trustworthy publication, well and legibly printed.'[565]

So how did Heaton lemmatise? A statistical analysis of the work shows that more than half of the entries are biographical in nature. The first part of the *Dictionary* comprises 624 people. Curiously the second part of the *Dictionary* also contains a large amount of biographical articles, 135. In total, there are 759 biographical entries in the *Dictionary*, equalling 56% of the 1365 entries. (The 'Times' journalist complained that

[560] See: 'Humphreys', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 122. – 'Magistrates', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 134. – 'Police', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 209. – 'Police Magistrate', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 209.
[561] See: 'Melbourne', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 137–138. – 'Queenscliff', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 227.
[562] 'Samoa', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 253.
[563] 'Cold', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 63.
[564] 'Presentation', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 219.
[565] 'Australian Dictionary of Dates', *The Times*, 15 October 1879, quoted in: Heaton, *Dictionary* (London edition).

'in several cases he [Heaton, N.K.] has evidently allowed men to write their own biographies' and that these now occupied disproportionate space.[566] Whether this allegation is true or not remains unclear.) Almost another 10% of the entries are geographical, i.e. colonies, towns, cities, islands, bays, waterbodies, mountains, plains and the like. A strikingly large number of entries in the *Dictionary* have to do with the topics of death. On top of these morbid entries, numerous articles deal with the matter of crime and mystery. Together with entries on illness, catastrophes and curiosities, these dark and curious entries make up for almost 4% of the whole *Dictionary*, or about 7% of the part on 'Dates'. The remaining entries – about 30% – cover a wide range of subjects, comparable to the subjects contained in the *AE*.

In terms of macrostructure the *AE* and the *Dictionary* had this in common, that biographical articles took up the largest amount of entries. Animals and plants, the next largest section in the *AE*, were not a priority in the *Dictionary*. Geographical articles on the other hand, featuring large in the *Dictionary*, were not a very strong focus of the *AE*. 'Dark and curious entries' are virtually absent from the *AE*.

4.1.1 Biographical Entries

As was the case with the people included in the *AE*, the men and women in Heaton's *Dictionary* had special relationships with Australia.[567] Heaton's notion of Australia, as used in the title of his work, included New Zealand as well. Some of the biographical articles dealt with people who had a connection with New Zealand, not Australia. New Zealand had been a separate colony since 1840,[568] and thus it would have been justified if Heaton had called his work *Australasian Dictionary* instead of *Australian Dictionary*. However, the main focus of the encyclopaedia remained Australia.

Of twenty randomly picked people in 'Men', all were either born in Australia – here and in the following this includes New Zealand –, had migrated to Australia or at least lived or worked there for a while.[569] The people contained in 'Dates' seem to have

[566] Ibid.
[567] The representation of women will be treated in a separate subchapter.
[568] Frank Welsh, *Great Southern Land: A New History of Australia* (Allen Lane, London 2004) p. 156.
[569] Arthur Martin A'Beckett (*Dictionary*, part 1, p. 1); Hon. James Balfour (part 1, pp. 8–9); Captain George Ward Cole (part 1, p. 41); Daniel Henry Deniehy (part 1, pp. 54–55); Sir James Hurtle Fisher (part 1, p. 66); George Herbert Gibson (part 1, p. 76); Henry Hicks Hocking (part, 1, p. 93); Reverend James Jefferis (part 1, 101); Right Rev. William Lanigan (part 1, p. 113); Charles Mann (part 1, pp. 129–130); Major Thomas Shuldham O'Halloran (part 1, p. 157); General Sir Thomas Simson Pratt (part, 1, p. 167); Sir Hercules George Robert Robinson (part 1, p. 175); Reverend George Stonehouse (part 1, p. 193); William Swainson

had similarly strong connections with Australia.[570] The only exception among the sample is John Renton whose entry does not show any connection with Australia or New Zealand.[571] In contrast to the biographical articles in 'Men', the entries in 'Dates' do not focus as strongly on the people's lives. Some biographical entries in 'Dates' are empty and refer back to the corresponding entry in 'Men'.[572] The articles are very brief, often just a couple of lines long. In some cases, these entries do not provide the reader with any biographical information at all. Their main focus is not the life of the people, but the role they played in Australasian society and history. The *Dictionary* tells its readers that Benjamin Boyd was 'the largest squatter of his time in Australia'[573] and that Captain Hobson was the 'first Governor of New Zealand'.[574] However, the distinction between the biographical entries in 'Men' and 'Dates' is not clear-cut.

In terms of the people's connection with Australia, the biographical articles in the *Dictionary* and the ones in the *AE* are similar.[575] However the entries in the *Dictionary*, especially in 'Men', also tend to report the treated person's life outside Australia, whereas the entries in the *AE* focus more on the person in the Australian context. The term 'Australia' is used more often in the *AE* entries. In the sample of twenty biographical articles it occurs fifteen times. The *Dictionary* only contains four 'Australia' in the sample of 'Men' and three in the sample of 'Dates'. Similarly, the *AE* entries comprise more formulations with superlatives such as 'the largest', 'the first' or other formulations that point out the significance of the person. However, such formulations in the *AE* are not more often combined with the term 'Australia' than in the *Dictionary*. Concerning the biographical articles, the difference between the two encyclopaedias is thus a gradual one, with the *AE* slightly more focussed on Australia as a nation than the *Dictionary*. By

---

(part 1, p. 198); William Kyffin Thomas (part 1, p. 202); Hon. Sir Julius Vogel (part 1, pp. 210–211); Colonel Whitmore (part 1, p. 219); Major-General Edward Buckley Wynyard (part 1, p. 230); 'William Adolphus Young (part 1, p. 231).

[570] H.R.H. Prince Alfred (part 2, p. 10); George Barrington (part 2, p. 39); Benjamin Boyd (part 2, p. 43); J.F. Campbell (part 2, p. 52); Ralph Darling (part 2, p. 85); Lady Franklin (part 2, p. 104); Rev. Henry Fulton (part 2, p. 108); Rev. William Healey (part 2, p. 118); Captain Hobson (part 2, p. 119); J.E. Manning (part 2, p. 134); Lieutenant Nobby (part 2, p. 180); Pelletier (part 2, p. 208); James Raymond (part 2, p. 241); John Renton (part 2, p. 242); Rev. Thomas Hobbes Scott (part 2, p. 255); Colonel Kenneth Snodgrass (part 2, p. 259); Captain Abel Jansen Tasman (part 2, p. 266); Sir Roger Charles Doughty Tichborne (part 2, pp. 271–274); Edward Trickett (part 2, p. 282); Mr. Justice Williams (part 2, p. 309).

[571] Heaton, 'Renton, John', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 242. The very brief article says that Renton had lived for eight years with 'the natives' of Malaysia and that he was rescued in 1876.

[572] Such entries have not been included in the above sample.

[573] Heaton, 'Boyd, Benjamin', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 43.

[574] Heaton, 'Hobson, Captain', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 119.

[575] For the biographical articles in the *AE* see chapter three.

including articles dealing with New Zealand, the *Dictionary* is not completely free from the concept of Australasia, although this is suggested in the title of the work.

Interestingly some formulations in biographical entries of the *AE* are almost identical with formulations in the *Dictionary*. On James Goodall Francis, one reads in the *AE* that he 'entered commercial life as a clerk in the firm of Boys and Pointer, which in 1847 passed into his hands and those of a partner'.[576] The relevant passage in the *Dictionary* says that Francis had remained with the company 'until 1847, when the business passed into his hands and those of his partner Mr. Macpherson'.[577] This is the only striking congruency between the two articles. The two encyclopaedias spell the name of Francis' company differently (although this might have to do with a misspelling): the *Dictionary* writes 'Boys and Painter', the *AE* 'Boys and Pointer'. The articles on Samuel Bennett, who was Heaton's father-in-law, are a similar case. There is an almost identical formulation, but otherwise the articles are not the same.[578]

Such similarities are not confirmed in the samples of twenty. The twenty randomly picked biographical entries in the *AE* show no conspicuous similarities with corresponding entries in the *Dictionary* – neither do the twenty randomly picked articles of the *Dictionary* with corresponding ones in the *AE*. The producers of the *AE* may have consulted the *Dictionary* and in individual cases adopted some of its formulations. It is more likely though that Heaton and Jose (or the authors who wrote the articles) had consulted some of the same sources and taken over formulations from there.

4.1.2 Biological Entries

In contrast to the *AE*, the *Dictionary* contains very few entries on animals and none on plants. There are only five entries on native animals and seven on introduced ones.[579] With the exception of 'Alpacas', 'Cattle' and 'Sheep', all of these articles are very short, sometimes consisting of a single sentence. On 'Grasshoppers' the reader only

[576] 'Francis, James Goodall', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 486.
[577] Heaton, 'Francis, Hon. James Goodall', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 72.
[578] In the *Dictionary* one reads: 'Came to Australia in 1841, under special engagement to Messrs. Stevens and Stokes'. (Heaton, 'Bennett, Samuel', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 16.) In the *AE* it says: 'came to Australia in 1841 under engagement to the then proprietors of the *Sydney Herald*'. ('Bennett, Samuel', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 155.)
[579] Native: Heaton, 'Grasshoppers', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 116. – 'Kangaroos', part 2, p. 125. – 'Moa', part 2, p. 163. – 'Snakes' part 2, p. 259. – 'Turtles' part 2, p. 282. Introduced: 'Alpacas', part 2, p. 10. – 'Angora Goats', part 2, p. 10. – 'Camels', part 2, p. 52. – 'Cashmere Goats', part 2, p. 52. – 'Cattle', part 2, p. 52. – 'Pigs', part 2, p. 208. – 'Sheep', part 2, pp. 256–257.

gets to know that 'GRASSHOPPERS, devastated large areas of country in South Australia, and in Riverina, New South Wales, November 27, 1872.'[580]

The entries on introduced animals in the *Dictionary* are mainly concerned with numbers and dates in connection with the introduction of the animals in Australia. The animals as such are not described, nor do the entries provide the reader with biological descriptions of the appearance or habits of the animals. 'Cashmere Goats' may serve as an example for the kind of knowledge presented in these articles: '49 Cashmere goats imported to Melbourne; of these more than half died before landing, 1863.'[581] In some of the articles Heaton added some practical knowledge, such as prizes for the animals, or statistics. The encyclopaedia's second part is a collection of dates and data, showing Heaton's obsession with numbers, dates and statistics. By comparison, the *AE* articles dealing with introduced animals are much longer and more detailed. The kind of knowledge given is quite similar. The entries in the *AE* also concentrate on financial information and other numbers and do not deal with the animals as such.[582]

A comparison of the entries on native animals is more revealing. As indicated in chapter three, the *AE* entries include a large amount of zoological knowledge The article 'Kangaroos and Wallabies' for example is nearly one and a half pages long and provides the reader with knowledge on the animals' place in the biological system, their distribution, appearance and so forth.[583] The article 'Kangaroos' in the *Dictionary* on the other hand reads as follows:

> *The dimensions of one caught near Goulburn were – From tip to tip, 9ft.; tail, 4ft.; head, 11 1/2in.; tail weighed 18 1/2lb. Another one was caught which measured 10ft, 6in. from tip to tip. In June, 1875, Mr. Licensed-surveyor James Evans killed a very large kangaroo near Cootamundra; the measurement from tip to tip being 11ft. 7in., and its weight 207lb. – the tail alone weighing 22 1/2lb.*
>
> *8,000 kangaroos killed in a battue at Trunkey Station, N.S.W., August 11, 1877.*[584]

[580] Heaton, 'Grasshoppers', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 116.
[581] Heaton, 'Cashmere Goats', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 52.
[582] See the following entries: 'Alpacas', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 52–53. – 'Camels', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 231–232. – Walter Scott Campbell, 'Cattle', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 243–246. – Walter Scott Campbell, 'Pigs', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 298–299. – Clarence Edward Cowley, 'Sheep', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 448–452. (There are no entries on 'Cashmere Goat' or 'Angora Goats'.)
[583] 'Kangaroos and Wallabies', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 691–692.
[584] Heaton, 'Kangaroos', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 125. – The addition to 'Kangaroos' at the end of part 2 contributes even more numbers. (Heaton, 'Kangaroos', *Dictionary*, part 'Corrections and Additions' (to part 2), p. 2.

In an article as short as this, Heaton manages to include eleven numbers, including two dates. This article is not an exception. The other four *Dictionary* articles dealing with native animals – 'Grasshoppers', 'Moa', 'Snakes' and 'Turtles' – are to a large extent collections of numbers and dates. The entry 'Moa' demonstrates again the inclusion of New Zealand in the work. In the *AE* there is no such entry.

The *Dictionary* articles on native animals do not include zoological knowledge on the animals. They focus on sizes, weights and dates for when the animals were killed. On 'Snakes' the encyclopaedia user gets to know that 'a black snake, 22 feet long, [was, N.K.] killed (…) by Mr. Fleming, a settler, January, 1826' and that 'during the first year of Sir John Franklin's administration in Tasmania nearly 14,000 snakes were killed'.[585] Similarly the entry on 'Turtles' says that 'a turtle weighing 6cwt., hooked by a fisherman in Broken Bay, December, 1805.'[586] The biological entries in Heaton's *Dictionary*, despite their scarcity, thus suggest an adherence to what could be called a 'biological cringe'.[587] Academics as well as the general public since the 1950s have discussed a so-called 'cultural cringe' in relation to Australia.[588] In 1980, H.P. Heseltine described the term as 'the unthinking admiration for everything foreign (especially English) which precluded regard for any excellence that might be found at home'.[589] This definition could also be applied to the field of biology. As demonstrated in chapter three, Australian animals and plants were for a long time conceived of as strange and peculiar, and even primitive or degenerate. *Chambers* is a good example for this attitude; however one can hardly speak of a biological cringe in connection with *Chambers* since the work was Scottish, and not Australian. Heaton's work on the other hand, being produced in Australia, by someone who lived in Australia for a long time and who had strong emotional ties with the country, is a clear candidate for the biological cringe. The *Dictionary's* articles on native animals give the reader the impression that these animals were creatures that needed to be caught, killed, weighed and measured up. This stands in stark contrast to the entries on imported animals that are portrayed as economically useful. The *Dictionary* entries imply that Australian nature had to be subordinated. This

[585] Heaton, 'Snakes', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 259.
[586] Heaton, 'Turtles', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 282.
[587] For the 'biological cringe' see also: Robin, *How a Continent*, pp. 8–9.
[588] The concept of the 'cultural cringe' originated from an essay by A.A. Phillips in the magazine *Meanjin*. See: A.A. Phillips, *A.A. Phillips on the Cultural Cringe* (Melbourne University Publishing, Carlton (VIC) 2006) p. vii.
[589] H.P. Heseltine, 'Introduction', *The Australian Tradition: Studies in Colonial Culture*, A.A. Phillips , 2nd edn., reissue (Longman Cheshire, Melbourne 1980) p. viii.

attitude towards native animals is diametrically opposed to the perspective in the *AE*, a work that was designed to instill pride of Australian wildlife.

4.1.3 Geographical Entries

The *Dictionary* contained a large number of geographical articles, as opposed to the *AE*, where geographical articles were not a priority. But whereas the geographical entries in the *AE* comprised knowledge on a wide range of aspects, the main purpose of the entries in the *Dictionary* does not seem to have been to provide the readers with knowledge – apart from numbers and dates. The entry 'Australia' in the *AE* included knowledge on many aspects of the nation – Heaton's 'Australia' is just a miscellany of numbers: statements of areas, distances, latitudes, longitudes and dates. The entry starts with a measuring up of the continent and continues in the same way with the individual colonies, ignoring Tasmania in doing so. The section on Queensland for example reads as follows:

> *Area, 678,600 square miles, or 434,304,000 acres. It lies between latitude S. 10° 37´ and 29°, and longitude E. 138° and 153° 30´. Its length from north to south is 1300 miles, its breadth 800 miles, and it has a coast line of 2550 miles. It is twelve times the size of England and Wales. It is bounded on the north by the Gulf of Carpentaria, and Torres Straits, which separate it from New Guinea; on the east by the South Pacific Ocean; on the south by New South Wales; on the west by South Australia, and by the 141st meridian of longitude, from latitude S. 29º to 26º; thence along the 138th meridian of longitude to the Gulf of Carpentaria.*[590]

The *Dictionary* articles dealing with cities, towns and states teem with formulations stating when something first happened or when certain public facilities and institutions were first opened or founded. The readers are told about the 'first arrival of cattle', the 'first municipal election', the 'first Mayor',[591] the 'name first given to the settlement',[592] the 'first Supreme Court',[593] the 'first Brisbane School of Arts',[594] the 'first sale of Crown lands', the 'first newspaper',[595] the 'first Wesleyan Chapel', the 'foundation of King's School'[596] and so on. In articles on rivers, bays and mountains verbs such as 'discover', 'explore', 'cross', 'name' and 'survey' abound.[597] Thus the

[590] Heaton, 'Australia', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 15.
[591] Heaton, 'Adelaide', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 8.
[592] Heaton, 'Albion', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 10.
[593] Heaton, 'Auckland', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 15.
[594] Heaton, 'Brisbane', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 43.
[595] Heaton, 'South Australia', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 260.
[596] Heaton, 'Parramatta', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 204.
[597] Heaton, 'Adelaide River', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 8. – 'Albert River', part 2, p. 10. – 'Arnheim Bay', part 2, p. 14. – 'Arbuthnot Range', part 2, p. 14. – 'Blue Mountains, Crossing of', part 2, p. 41. – 'Exmouth,

geographical articles in the *Dictionary* were designed in a similar way to the biological ones. Just as the wildlife was described as a matter for subordination, the land was depicted as a subject that had to be conquered, measured and built up.

There are few exceptions. Some geographical articles in the *Dictionary* offer more than an amassment of numbers. There are articles dealing with places outside the Australian colonies, such as 'Fiji' and 'New Guinea', but also 'New Caledonia', 'New Zealand' and 'Norfolk Island'.[598] One reason why these articles go beyond numbers and dates might be that they had to deliver all the knowledge that Heaton considered to be important in connection with these places. Knowledge to do with the Australian colonies by contrast was not to be contained in one entry only. It could be spread over several articles. For example, Heaton created a separate entry on 'Australian Land Explorers', but exploration in New Zealand was included in the article 'New Zealand. This proves that the main focus of the *Dictionary* was the Australian colonies, even though the Australasian was given space as well.

Another reason why these *Dictionary* entries were treated as exceptions is indicated in the entry 'New Guinea', where it says:

> *Mr. Goldie, who appears up to the present time to have made the most explorations into New Guinea, describes the interior as far as he has penetrated, as a splendid grazing country, covered with many grasses, identical with those of Australia, and well watered with numerous small rivers, and dotted with stunted eucalyptus; here and there are native villages, surrounded by plantations of cocoa-nuts [sic!] and banana.*[599]

Evidently there was not a great deal of knowledge on New Guinea available to Heaton; he had to rely on one single report on 'the interior' of the country. New Guinea was unfamiliar territory to people living in Australia, and therefore in more need of description than, for example, South Australia.

A second type of exception in the *Dictionary* consists of occasional curious remarks that seem to be out of context. In the article 'Sydney' one reads: 'An emu ran

---

Mount', part 2, p. 94. – 'Goulburn River', part 2, p. 113. – 'Hastings, River', part 2, p. 117. – 'Hawkesbury, River', part 2, p. 117.

[598] Heaton, 'Fiji', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 97–98. – 'New Guinea', part 2, pp. 169–171. – 'New Caledonia', part 2, p. 169. – 'New Zealand', part 2, pp. 176–180. – 'Norfolk Island', part 2, pp. 180–181.

[599] Heaton, 'New Guinea', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 170.

through Sydney and was shot. It stood 7 feet four inches high. March, 1788.'[600] This kind of remark leads us to the next type of entry in the *Dictionary*:

4.1.4 Morbid Entries

In the *Dictionary*, there are no less than three entries dealing with suicide, and a large number of other entries are concerned with death, such as 'Cemeteries', 'Funerals, Public', 'Executions' and 'Obituary'.[601] Some of these entries are accounts of cases that seem to be randomly chosen. The entry 'Suicide' for instance renders the following three cases:

> *The first suicide in New South Wales was that of a man who hung himself in gaol, 1803.*
>
> *The Spanish Consul in Sydney committed suicide by throwing himself from a window, May 28, 1869.*
>
> *Mr. John De Haga, opera singer, committed suicide by shooting himself at Williamstown, near Melbourne, October 12, 1872.*[602]

The most curious articles are 'Obituary' and 'Executions'. Both entries are very long in comparison to most other *Dictionary* articles. 'Obituary' is eleven and a half pages long, including personalities who died between the very beginning of British settlement and the year the *Dictionary* was published. It lists the name of the person, often their profession or another attribute to identify them, the date of their deaths, sometimes the reason for their deaths and in some cases the colony where they had lived (or died). The professions indicated suggest that almost all of the people listed were famous or at least widely known at the time. There are politicians, journalists, scientists, soldiers, priests, famous colonists and 'pioneers' and many more. All Australian colonies (and New Zealand) are represented.

The article 'Executions' begins with three little paragraphs, informing the reader about 'the first execution in Australia', an 'extraordinary failure of' an execution and 'places of execution'. The entry proceeds with about three and a half pages of executions, detailing who was executed where and when for what reason, before finishing with

[600] Heaton, 'Sydney', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 265.
[601] Heaton, 'Suicide, Attempted', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 263. – 'Suicides', part 2, p. 263. – 'Suicides in Australasia', part 2, p. 263. – 'Cemeteries', part 2, p. 52. – 'Funerals, Public', part 2, p. 108. – 'Executions', part 2, pp. 90–94. – 'Obituary', part 2, pp. 181–192.
[602] Heaton, 'Suicides', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 263.

statistics about the number of people executed in New South Wales.[603] The list is split into the colonies New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland and Victoria. Heaton was evidently highly interested in peculiar and strange events such as the failure of an execution. Some of the cases of executions listed comprise short reports or anecdotes of curious or sensational incidents. About the execution of Owen M'Queeny one gets to know the following: 'At the execution of this criminal a woman applied for permission to have her hands "streaked over" with the hands of the dead man.'[604] On the execution of James Murphy it says: 'The executioner sent from Melbourne to Geelong was an old mate of the criminal, and was so much affected that he had difficulty to perform his duty.'[605]

Overlapping with the topics of death and curiosities is another theme, crime and mystery. The *Dictionary* contains a surprising number of entries on the subjects, such as 'Bentley Mystery, the', 'Crimes and Criminals, Remarkable', 'Fraud', 'Prisons', 'Smuggling' and 'Swindlers, Notorious'.[606] Some of these articles consist of short and random accounts of cases, and others, such as 'Crimes and Criminals, Remarkable', contain long lists. The dark and morbid entries in the *Dictionary* are complemented by articles dealing with illness and catastrophes.[607]

In the *AE*, the subjects of death, crime, illness and curiosity are virtually non-existent. There are no entries concerned with death or curiosities, and only three that could be categorised as crime and mystery, 'Bushranging', 'Prisons' and 'Fisher's Ghost'.[608] 'Prisons' is an empty article referring to 'Police', and the mystery of 'Fisher's Ghost' is told in a very critical manner, dismissing accounts of a ghost being seen. But there is an entry common to the two encyclopaedias, dealing with the subject of catastrophes, 'Wrecks and Shipping Disasters'.[609] The *AE* even outdoes the *Dictionary* by far with the length of its list about wrecked ships. Its article is over fifty pages long, compared to six in the *Dictionary*. Perhaps the fact that the disasters happened at sea, i.e.

---

[603] In 'Corrections and Additions' even more statistics are provided. (Heaton, 'Executions', *Dictionary*, part 'Corrections and Additions (to part 2), p. 1.)
[604] Heaton, 'Executions', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 93.
[605] Ibid.
[606] Heaton, 'Bentley Mystery', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 39. – 'Crimes and Criminals, Remarkable', part 2, pp. 79–83. – 'Fraud', part 2, p. 104. – 'Prisons', part 2, pp. 220–221. – 'Smuggling', part 2, p. 259. – 'Swindlers, Notorious' part 2, pp. 263–264.
[607] See for example: Heaton, 'Earthquakes', *Dictionary*, part 89. – 'Floods and Draughts', part 2, pp. 101–103. –'Epidemics', part 2, p. 90. – 'Lunatics', part 2. p. 133.
[608] 'Bushranging', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 219–223. – 'Fisher's Ghost', vol. 1, pp. 464–465. – 'Prisons', vol. 2, p. 337.
[609] 'Wrecks and Shipping Disasters', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 684–736. – Heaton, 'Wrecks and Shipping Disasters', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 310–316.

outside Australia, made it possible for Angus & Robertson to include such a negative lemma? That the *Dictionary* and the *AE* article were entered under exactly the same lemma indicates that Jose probably knew the article in the *Dictionary*, and that he might have used it as a reference.[610] Some parts of the list suggest that he even might have copied from the *Dictionary* here and there. But the great majority of the listed cases in the *AE* article are different from the ones in the *Dictionary*, some of them more detailed. The sheer length of the *AE* article leaves no doubt that the main source for this article must have been a different one.

The question arises why there is such a disproportionate number of entries in the *Dictionary* that relate to death, crime and curiosities. Was there a special interest in Australia in these subjects around 1879? In Western societies the collection of data on crimes and prisons was in vogue in the nineteenth century.[611] The late eighteenth and the nineteenth century had seen the rise of the so-called statistical movement which had made statistical practices widespread.[612] Thus the collection of data on crimes and prison was part of a larger trend. The basis for this movement had already been laid down at the end of the eighteenth century, when the development of moral sciences had aroused a strong interest in knowledge on society, and statistics came to be considered an apt tool for observing society.[613] The 1820s and 1830s witnessed the birth of a new kind of statistical science in several European countries, a science that was interested in certain aspects or problems of society, such as crime.[614] The increasing significance of statistics during the nineteenth century is linked with the rise of the nation state. Rulers used statistics as a means to understand and govern the state's population. For supporters of the nation building process, statistics – like history and geography – were ideal means to give the abstract nation a concrete body.[615] By the end of the nineteenth century statistical methods were used widely by state authorities as well as by the public.[616]

The recently published index to the *Argus*, a major Australian daily newspaper of the time published in Melbourne, shows that interest in the topics of crime and death was

[610] The *AE* entry is not signed which probably means that Jose wrote it.
[611] See: Stuart Woolf, 'Statistics and the Modern State', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31 (3), 1989, p. 589.
[612] Silvana Patriarca, *Numbers and Nationhood: Writing Statistics in Nineteenth-Century Italy* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1996) p. 1.
[613] Woolf, 'Statistics', pp. 594–595.
[614] Patriarca, *Numbers*, p. 18.
[615] Ibid. pp. 1 and 7. See also: Woolf, 'Statistics', p. 597.
[616] See: Patriarca, *Numbers*, p. 17.

also strong in Australia.[617] A search of the index for 'Homicide' results in 1,189 hits, meaning that between the years 1870 and 1879, the *Argus* published 1,189 articles to do with homicide. On average the *Argus* contained an article dealing with homicide about every third day. 'Suicide' (1,250), 'Drowning' (1,728) and 'Theft' (5,664) were even more frequent, although these subjects might overlap. In the index, each newspaper article is listed under several headings. There are in a addition many more headings to do with death and crime, such as 'Arson' (473), 'Funerals' (377) 'Child Abuse' (333), 'Death' (306). This excludes death notices, which were not included in the index. Another source, the *Times* article from 1879 shows that it was considered self-evident that crimes were so prominent in this kind of encyclopaedia: 'Of course, "Crimes and Criminals" occupy a large space.'[618] In the context of this general trend, the *Dictionary's* long list of crimes and executions make sense.

Regarding the macrostructure, the two encyclopaedias show similarities. Both Jose and Heaton lemmatised according to the imagined community of the nation. One could object that the *Dictionary's* macrostructure cannot be called national since the *Dictionary's* imagined community had a wider scope than the nation that was officially founded in 1901. But that an imagined community changed in the course of time does not necessarily mean that it had been less real in the past. Thus one could maintain that the *Dictionary*, the first Australian encyclopaedia, displayed a national orientation in its macrostructure, allowing for the fact that the Australian nation evoked had a different extent to the one portrayed in the *AE* almost half a century later. The centre of the nation depicted for the *Dictionary* was nevertheless the nation that was to be founded about two decades later. Even in the *AE*, parts of what used to be called Australasia had still not completely disappeared.[619] Despite the national orientation, neither encyclopaedia hides the fact that it was published in Sydney. In many entries, New South Wales is given preference over other colonies.

[617] Geraldine Suter (chief indexer), *The Argus Index 1870–1879*, John Hirst (ed.-in-chief) (La Trobe University, Melbourne 2005). (www.nla.gov.au/apps/argus, accessed 12 October 2006.)
[618] 'Australian Dictionary of Dates', *The Times.*
[619] See for example the entries on 'New Zealand' and 'Papua' ('New Zealand up to 1841', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 201–205. – 'Papua', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 253–262.)

There is, however, a clear difference in the macrostructure of the two encyclopaedias. Whereas the producers of the *AE* made sure that no lemma could throw a bad light on the Australian nation, the *Dictionary* also included lemmata with negative connotations. Among these are the entries dealing with crime. It is inconceivable that the *AE* could have comprised an entry that detailed the crimes being committed within the Australian nation. This difference between the *AE* and the *Dictionary* is also reflected in the content of some of the entries, particularly in the biological and geographical articles. The *Dictionary* did not describe the Australian landscape and wildlife in positive terms as the *AE* did, but as a savage wilderness that needed to be tamed.

The microstructure of the *AE* maintained a strict national orientation. The *Dictionary* on the other hand was less stringent. The biographical articles, the entries that make up for a great deal more than half of the *Dictionary* entries, also tend to describe the person's life outside Australia.

The *Dictionary's* structure is thus leaning strongly towards a national orientation, although to a lesser degree than the *AE*. The difference in structure between the two encyclopaedias is a matter of degree. What is more striking is the use that is made of the national structures in the two encyclopaedias. The numerous numbers in the *Dictionary* give the impression that Heaton was still attempting to lay claim on Australia. The kind of knowledge provided in the *Dictionary* makes it highly unlikely that the work could have functioned as a Konversationslexikon.

4.2 Freezing Views

Is this gradual change in national orientation mirrored in the content of the encyclopaedias? The portrayal of three groups of people, of Aborigines, Chinese and women, are apt test cases for answering this question. The Australian nation building process, and in particular the political foundation of the nation through Federation, meant that the position of these groups of people within the Australian society changed. This altered position was connected with a shift in the way Aborigines, Chinese and women were portrayed in public images. In the case of Aboriginal and Chinese people, as well as many other Asians, the foundation of the Australian nation brought about a clear devaluation of their already marginalised and disadvantaged position.

Aboriginal Australians were explicitly excluded from the national community in 1901. The Constitution of the Commonwealth comprised two Acts which dealt directly with Aboriginal people, refusing them citizenship – Aboriginal people were not to be included in the census – and leaving the responsibility for Aboriginal affairs to the individual states. In the *Commonwealth Franchise Act* of 1902 Aboriginal people were explicitly forbidden to vote.[620] The indigenous population was not given citizen status until 1948, and even then they were still not included in the census and forbidden to vote in federal elections for another twenty years. The exclusion of the indigenous population from the nation was justified with various racist beliefs about Aboriginal people. Depictions of Aboriginal people as 'childlike', 'backward', 'simple' and as the 'other' were common.[621] This labelling of Aboriginal people as the 'other' was crucial in the context of nation building: nations distance themselves from other nations, whether they live outside of or within that nation's geographic boundaries. People can see their own nation only as something distinct if it is set against something that is not part of it. Bain Attwood writes:

> *It is now generally acknowledged that, at least since the Enlightenment, the category of the "self" or the group is fashioned through the construction of an Other, which is outside and opposite, and that the making of an identity rests upon negating, repressing or excluding things antithetical to it. By creating such binary opposition(s), the heterogeneity and difference within the former category is displaced and so the unitary self or group is manufactured. (…) Hence, Europeans have forged a collective identity through a discourse which sets them apart from non-Europeans, especially "the Aborigines".*[622]

The process of forming communities is linked with denying excluded groups their own diversity. This peculiarity of creating an 'other' is not unique to national communities. However nations, being imagined and not tangible, rely particularly heavily on this mechanism for their own definition.

Considering this negative importance Aboriginal people were attributed in the nation building process, it is not surprising that entries on Aboriginal topics were discussed extensively during the production of the *AE*. While the *AE* correspondence regarding many entries only allows conclusions about the structure of the encyclopaedia and remains silent in terms of the content of the articles, it does allow a deep insight into

[620] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, pp. 128–130.
[621] Patricia Grimshaw et al., *Creating a Nation* (McPhee Gribble Publishers, Ringwood (VIC) 1994) p. 279.
[622] Bain Attwood, 'Introduction', *Power, Knowledge and Aborigines*, Bain Attwood and John Arnold (eds.) (La Trobe University Press, Bundoora (VIC) 1992) pp. iii.

the controversial content of Aboriginal topics. Letters between Jose and the authors of the Aboriginal articles show what importance the topic was given by the producers of the *AE*.

The Chinese in Australia found themselves in a slightly different, but also very marginalised position. As explained in chapter two, ever since the gold-rushes, Chinese people had been portrayed as immoral, as transmitters of disease and as underminers of working conditions in Australia. With Federation, Australian politicians incorporated into the Commonwealth's legislation the desire for an exclusion of Asian people from the Australian nation and the wish for a 'White Australia'. In December 1901 the *Immigration Restriction Act* was passed, an act that made it extremely difficult for Chinese people to emigrate to Australia. The intention to exclude certain nationalities was disguised with a dictation test. Prospective immigrants had to sit a fifty word dictation test in any European language and if they failed they were refused entry. As Russell and Chubb wrote, 'it was not a difficult task for the administering customs officer to use a language in which unwanted immigrants could not succeed'.[623] This measure was directed against Asian immigrants, and in particular the Chinese. Although this did not exclude those Chinese people from the nation who were already in Australia, it was made plain to them that they were undesired. The dictation test was applied until 1958.

Whereas Aboriginal and Chinese people experienced a clear deterioration of their social and political position, the case of women was more complicated. On the one hand, Federation brought about an increase of political rights for women. Australian women had fought for enfranchisement since the 1880s, and the first suffrage society had been founded in 1884.[624] In 1894 women in South Australia got their right to vote, and five years later also Western Australian women were enfranchised. Australian suffrage movements benefited from the coming of Federation – women were victorious in their efforts to influence the first Commonwealth Parliament.[625] On the 12 June 1902 the *Commonwealth Franchise Act* gave all white Australian women the right to vote in federal matters and to run for seats in the federal parliament.[626] The Australian nation building process at the same time brought about a strengthening of the notion of women

[623] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, p. 112.
[624] Anne Summers, *Damned Whores and God's Police*, 2nd rev. edn. (Penguin Books, Camberwell (VIC) and London 2002) p. 396.
[625] Audrey Oldfield, *Woman Suffrage in Australia: a Gift or a Struggle?* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992) p. 15.
[626] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, p. 272.

as mothers. By 1880 a new stereotype of women, Anne Summers calls this the 'God's Police Stereotype', had become widely accepted.[627] It comprised the notion that women were morally superior to men, and that they therefore were meant to be the guardian of the home and the moral educator of the family. Although this meant that women had gained 'the kind of power, formerly held by priests', it also defined women's lives entirely through their family.[628] The conception of women as moral forces and as guardians of the family was so strong that not even the advocates of suffrage resisted it.[629]

Although this ideology of women was already in place before the Australian nation building process is said to have started, the formation of the Australian nation had the effect of strengthening and closer defining the notion of women as mothers and guardians of morality. In the context of the nation, the role of women as mothers took on an even larger significance than before. They had to give birth to and educate the children of the nation.[630] With the adoption of the 'White Australia' policy an increased pressure was put on women. White women were expected to have children with white men and thus produce the desired Australian citizen. Some groups, such as exponents of the Labour movement, believed that since women were supposed to be mothers, they should not be allowed to occupy public positions. This view was also strongly supported by the writers of the *Bulletin*.[631]

The First World War did not bring about a change in the way women's social role was perceived. Historians disagree about whether the First World War improved the chances of Australian women in the working world. Whereas Patricia Grimshaw et al. write that with the First World War women made limited progress,[632] Summers claims that 'the First World War did not provide an opportunity for Australian women to step beyond their traditional roles.'[633] However, there is no doubt that the main role Australian women in the First World War were given was 'to maintain the home front and this phrase was interpreted very literally.'[634] During the war, the national duty of motherhood

[627] See: Summers, *Damned Whores*.
[628] Ibid. p. 359.
[629] Ibid. p. 407.
[630] See: Alomes, *A Nation?*, p. 41.
[631] Summers, *Damned Whores*, pp. 181–182 and 186–187.
[632] Grimshaw et al., *Creating a Nation*, pp. 215–217.
[633] Summers, *Damned Whores*, p. 426.
[634] Ibid. p. 432.

also entailed sacrificing one's son to the nation by letting him go to war.[635] After the war and in the 1920s, women's position in Australian society can best be described with the term 'citizen mothers'.[636] Although women were officially recognised as citizens, the first and foremost task Australian society attributed them was that of the mother and homemaker.

It has thus been established that the way in which Aborigines, Chinese and women were portrayed was part of the larger nation building project. Whereas Aboriginal and Chinese people were forced into taking on the role of the 'other' and the unwanted, women were given a role within the nation, but one that was restricted to being mothers of the male Australian citizens. This distribution of roles in the period is commonplace, and it is not the goal of this study to prove it once more. But if the above described shifts in the portrayal of Aborigines, Chinese and women could be detected in the *AE*, it would signify much more than another piece of proof for these roles. Whereas media such as newspapers, magazines or novels can only promote specific views and opinions, encyclopaedias have considerably more power. They transform views into general knowledge and give subjective views and opinions an air of objectivity. Thus if shifts in the portrayal of Aborigines, Chinese and women can be detected in the encyclopaedias, it would mean that these had reached the status of generally accepted knowledge.

4.2.1 Portrayal of Aboriginal People

There is no evidence that Heaton had any help in producing his *Dictionary*. It appears to have been substantially the product of a single man. It follows that the entries concerned with Aboriginal people were written – or at least compiled or chosen – by Heaton. In the *AE* on the other hand, several authors were contributing information on Aboriginal people. The two main articles dealing with Aborigines were 'Aboriginal languages' by Sidney Herbert Ray and 'Aborigines', a joint product of Walter Baldwin Spencer and William Ramsay Smith. Baldwin Spencer's name was well-known in Australia at the time. He was a famous, and one of the first, Australian anthropologists. Baldwin Spencer had emigrated to Australia from Britain in 1887 to take up a position as Professor of Biology at the University of Melbourne. Together with anthropologist Frank Gillen he had between 1894 and 1901 in word and pictures recorded various aspects of

[635] Grimshaw et al., *Creating a Nation*, p. 211.
[636] Ibid. p. 228.

the life of the Arrernte people in Central Australia.[637] Baldwin Spencer was an adherent of a Social Darwinist theory. Like his namesake Herbert Spencer, he believed in the 'survival of the fittest', and like many of his contemporaries Baldwin Spencer thought that the Australian Aborigines were at a lower stage in their evolution and that they were therefore inferior to Europeans. Hand in hand with this belief went the conviction that Aboriginal people were doomed to 'die out', a conviction shared by the majority of non-Aboriginal Australians.[638] In the nineteenth and early twentieth century Aboriginal people were studied as 'living evidence of a universal human past'.[639] Towards the end of the 1920s this evolutionist anthropology was no longer the dominant paradigm. Now social anthropology was supposed to be more practical, 'useful in facilitating better government administration, developing more appropriate policies, and bringing about a sympathetic understanding of "Aboriginal culture".'[640] The *AE* was published at a time when social anthropology was just about to change.

Baldwin Spencer was supposed to provide the whole entry on 'Aborigines', revising an article of his that had originally been printed in the British Association Book in 1914.[641] But already in 1919 Baldwin Spencer suggested to Herbert James Carter that he engage a second author, an anatomist, to write about the 'physical or anthropometric' side of the topic.[642] But Carter does not seem to have followed Spencer's advice. A letter by Jose to Baldwin Spencer, dated September 1921, shows that the entry was then still in Baldwin Spencer's hands. Jose was not fully satisfied with Baldwin Spencer's article:

> *As far as it goes, we could desire nothing better. But, being written for a scientific body, it left untouched a good many side [sic!] of blackfellow life which are of great interest to the ordinary man – and it is to the ordinary man that an encyclopaedia must appeal. E.g., there is little or nothing on the blackfellow's daily life, his food, methods of hunting, occupations, numbers, destiny, folklore, etc.*[643]

Jose suggested that Baldwin Spencer's article be complemented with 'other sources'. Baldwin Spencer immediately agreed and suggested an author to write those sections: Dr.

---

[637] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, pp. 113 and 120.
[638] Russell and Chubb, *One destiny!*, pp. 116 and 121–122. For Herbert Spencer see: Patrick Brantlinger, *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800–1930* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London 2003) pp. 177ff.
[639] Gillian Cowlishaw, 'Studying Aborigines: Changing Canons in Anthropology and History', *Power, Knowledge and Aborigines*, Bain Attwood and John Arnold (eds.) (La Trobe University Press, Bundoora (VIC) 1992) p. 21.
[640] Attwood, 'Introduction', pp. vi–vii.
[641] See: Letter from Jose on 22 September 1921 to Baldwin Spencer, NLA: MS 708.
[642] Letter from Baldwin Spencer on 11 September 1919 to Carter, ML: ZML A7273.
[643] Letter from Jose on 22 September 1921 to Baldwin Spencer, NLA: MS 708.

S.A. Smith from Sydney University.[644] However Jose chose somebody else, William Ramsay Smith, a man described in the *AE* authors index as the 'Chairman of the Health Department of South Australia, author of *In Southern Seas*'.[645] The entry on 'Aborigines' caused Jose a great deal of worrying when he was finally faced with the task of combining the contributions of Baldwin Spencer and Ramsay Smith. He wrote to Baldwin Spencer:

> *The Aborigines article has been giving me a good deal of trouble, owing to the fact that it is not entirely the product of a single brain. However, I am trusting to your kindness to pardon me for doing in the end something that you asked me not to do – interlarding the other matter with yours. My proposal is to interlard sections, keeping each section the work of a single man. The note at the beginning of the copy enclosed will explain the exact system to you. In one or two cases, where you had made brief remarks about a subject and I had received fuller accounts from elsewhere, I have taken the liberty of substituting the fuller account for yours; but I think this is rare.*[646]

This is how it was finally done. 'Aborigines' consists of numerous paragraphs dealing with various aspects of the topic, some written by Baldwin Spencer, others by Ramsay Smith, all signed with the corresponding initials.

So how do the two encyclopaedias compare in their treatment of Aboriginal people? Interestingly Ramsay Smith consulted the *Dictionary* for the *AE* entry 'Aborigines'. There is a quote in the entry from the *Dictionary* where corroborrees are described as 'the medium through which the delights of poetry and the drama are enjoyed'.[647] Ramsay Smith was honest enough to put the quote into quotation marks, but did not indicate where the quote came from.

The *Dictionary* contains entries such as 'Aboriginal Cricketers', 'Aboriginal Names', 'Aboriginal, Petrified', 'Aboriginals', 'Aborigines', 'Corroborree', 'Cricketers, Aboriginal', and 'Missions to the Australian Blacks'. Also entries such as 'Australian Land Explorers', and 'Explorations' provide information about Heaton's attitude towards the Aboriginal population. The lemma 'Aboriginal, Petrified' and an entry to do with the indigenous population of New Zealand, 'Traffic in Human Maori Heads', demonstrate once again Heaton's liking of the morbid. The *Dictionary's* entries provide the reader mainly with knowledge about customs and traditions of Aboriginal people and about

[644] Letter from Baldwin Spencer on 4 October 1921 to Jose, NLA: MS 708.
[645] 'Contributors', *AE*, vol. 1, p. ix.
[646] Letter from Jose on 28 November 1922 to Baldwin Spencer, NLA: MS 708.
[647] Compare: William Ramsay Smith, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 30. And: Heaton, 'Corroboree', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 73.

violence between black and white. The reader also receives a physical description of Aboriginal people and – truly in the spirit of the work – some lists and statistical information. The article 'Aboriginals' comprises a section 'Numbers of' where estimates of the number of Aboriginal people in the various colonies, at various times, are given.[648]

The entries in the *AE*, ranging from 'Aboriginal Languages', 'Aborigines' and 'Black Trackers' to 'Boomerangs' and 'Bunyip' and to 'Musquito' and 'Truganini', contain a wider range of knowledge on Aborigines. There is a debate on the 'Aboriginal race', its supposed origin and destiny, and a detailed description of various Aboriginal languages.[649] The articles 'Aboriginal Languages' and 'Aborigines' are illustrated with numerous pictures of people and weapons, implements and other objects. In contrast to the *Dictionary*, the *AE* does not contain statistical information on Aboriginal people. In the statistics of the entry 'Population', Aborigines are explicitly excluded.[650] There was no statistical information available to the producers of the *AE* because the Constitution of the Commonwealth ruled that Aboriginal people were to be excluded from the census. Not surprisingly, there is also no mention of Aboriginal people in the *AE* article 'Federation'.[651]

There are a number of features common to the *Dictionary* and the *AE*. Both encyclopaedias include knowledge on other indigenous peoples, such as those of New Zealand, Papua and New Guinea. But for both the focus is mainly on the Aboriginal people of Australia. Biographical entries about Aboriginal people are scarce, in the case of the *Dictionary* inexistent. In entries that do not explicitly deal with Aboriginal people, such as entries on exploration, the indigenous population is only attributed a marginal role, and a largely negative one. In 'Australian Land Explorers' and 'Explorations' (*Dictionary*) as well as in 'Exploration by Land' (*AE*) Aboriginal people are either mentioned only briefly as members of a certain expedition or appear as vicious attackers.[652] The only difference is that in the *AE* the language used when describing these alleged attacks is even more negative. Expressions like 'the natives harassed them',

[648] Heaton, 'Aboriginals', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 5.
[649] William Ramsay Smith and Walter Baldwin Spencer, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 15–18 and 34–35. – Sidney Herbert Ray, 'Aboriginal Languages', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 2–15.
[650] 'Population', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 314–315.
[651] 'Federation', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 444–452.
[652] Heaton, 'Australian Land Explorers', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 16–31. – Heaton, 'Explorations', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 95–96. – 'Exploration by Land', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 418–432.

'persistent and ferocious attacks by natives', 'being troubled by hostile blacks' occur.[653] The names used for Aboriginal people in the two works are largely the same, covering a wide range including 'Aboriginals', 'Aborigines' and 'tribes', but also 'blacks', 'natives' and 'savages'. Interestingly, in the *AE*, Aboriginal languages are called 'Australian' and at one point Aboriginal society is referred to as 'Australian society'.[654] This is rather surprising considering how the *AE* otherwise was so well in tune with excluding Aboriginal people from the Australian nation.

Both the *Dictionary* and the *AE* portray Aboriginal people as bellicose. In the *Dictionary* the violence between black and white is clearly portrayed as going both ways. There is not only a list 'Outrages by, but also one titled 'Outrages against' in the entry 'Aboriginals'. In both lists strong vocabulary is used: 'violation and ill-treatment of five native women', 28 Aboriginal people 'barbarously murdered', '170 blacks slaughtered', 'many acts of aggression' by 'aboriginal natives', 'destruction of cattle, and other acts of violence' by 'aboriginal natives' and white people being 'massacred'. The section 'Outrages against' refers to the article on crimes, something the section 'Outrages by' does not do.[655] In 'Crimes and Criminals' the Myall Creek Massacre is mentioned and condemned.[656] The *AE* is less balanced in attributing violence to both sides. Aggression mainly occurs on the side of the Aborigines according to the *AE*. There are occasional remarks about wrong-doings of white people. Ramsay Smith in one of his sections in 'Aborigines' writes:

> *In the early days the number of aboriginals diminished through quarrels with the settlers – the whites violating some aboriginal law, the blacks retaliating, or vice versa. For something that from a white man's point of view was a crime a whole tribe would, in official language, be "dispersed;" and similar methods were employed unofficially.*[657]

In essence, the role attributed to Australians of European origin is positive in both encyclopaedias. In the *Dictionary's* one reads regarding Victoria's Aborigines: 'Every effort is made to induce them to pursue profitable employments, and the education of the young receives attention.'[658] In the *AE's* 'Mission', C.R.W. assures his readers that 'the

[653] 'Exploration by Land', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 427 and 429–430.
[654] Sidney Herbert Ray, 'Aboriginal Languages', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 2. – Walter Baldwin Spencer, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 16.
[655] Heaton, 'Aboriginals', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 5–6.
[656] Heaton, 'Crimes and Criminals', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 80.
[657] William Ramsay Smith, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 34.
[658] Heaton, 'Aboriginals', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 5.

Australian board of missions devotes much attention to the aborigines.'[659] Although in both encyclopaedias there are remarks in which distinctions are made between different groups of people – 'the proceedings and ceremonies appear to differ widely in the different tribes' –[660] there is still a great deal of generalisation in both works about the 'Australian Aboriginal', especially evident in physical descriptions of Aboriginal people.[661]

This is where the congruence between the two encyclopaedias ends. In the entries that explicitly deal with the indigenous population of Australia, Aboriginal people are portrayed much more positively in the *Dictionary*. Heaton's 'Aborigines' displays admiration for the customs and traditions of indigenous people. Heaton writes about a 'great educational system', 'great regard for their dead' and 'affection'.[662] In the *AE* positive descriptions of Aboriginal people are largely absent, with the exception of sections written by Ramsay Smith in 'Aborigines'. The article on 'Aborigines' is self-contradictory: Ramsay Smith and Baldwin Spencer evidently saw the indigenous population of Australia in very different lights. Baldwin Spencer thought Aboriginal people were ignorant as the following quote illustrates:

> *Australia has never been stocked with wild animals dangerous to human beings, nor with any apparently suitable for domestication. Even supposing there had been domesticable animals, it is quite possible that the aboriginal would have done nothing with them. He grinds many sorts of grass-seed to make into crude cakes; but it never occurs to him to sow the seed, and so insure a certain amount of food supply. In many tribes this is to be associated with the fact that he knows nothing of the relation between the seed and the plant, and thinks that the latter grows because he makes it do so by means of magic.*[663]

Ramsay Smith on the other hand regarded Aboriginal people as intelligent. He contradicts Baldwin Spencer's judgement that Aboriginal people, even if there had been suitable animals, would not have been capable of domesticating them. Some pages after Baldwin Spencer's verdict Ramsay Smith writes:

> *The lack of domesticated animals is often instanced as evidence of the aboriginal's inability to domesticate animals. But where were the materials to work upon? Who that knows Australian fauna can imagine any aboriginal endeavouring to plough with a kangaroo or trying to milk a wallaby? When*

[659] C.R.W. 'Missions', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 123. The author's full name is not listed in the index.
[660] Heaton, 'Aboriginals', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 3.
[661] See: Heaton, 'Aborigines', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 8. – William Ramsay Smith, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 20–21.
[662] Heaton, 'Aboriginals', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 3.
[663] Walter Baldwin Spencer, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 15–16.

> *horses were introduced, the blackfellow proved himself unsurpassed in the art of horsebreaking and managing all varieties of imported domestic animals.*[664]

This attitude of defence threads the whole of Ramsay Smith's portrayal of Aboriginal people. Again and again the reader encounters remarks in terms of 'Aboriginal people are said to be, but in fact they are not'. In the part 'Dwelling, Food-supply, etc.', Ramsay Smith assures his readers: 'It is often said that he has no foresight in the provision of food. This is a mistake; he rarely leaves the gathering or catching of food until he is hungry.'[665] Ramsay Smith's defence culminates in the end of the article where he goes as far as questioning contemporary anthropological theory in general:

> *To one who knows how the blackfellow even in a single lifetime reacts to new influences – moral, intellectual and mechanical – the facts seem to upset all theories of cranical capacities, cerebral functioning and mental operations. They raise the question, indeed, whether ordinary anthropological investigations and tests supply the kind and amount of evidence with which we credit them for elucidating the evolution of races and the relations of peoples. It would appear that civilized man knows as little regarding the possibilities of the mind of his uncivilized brother as he does regarding those primitive savage instincts which he for a long time supposed to be dormant, dead, or never existent in the civilization to which he belongs.*[666]

Ramsay Smith might here also have alluded to the anthropological view that 'the Australian aborigines (…) reveal the conditions under which the early ancestors of the human race existed', as Baldwin Spencer writes.[667] Despite his evidently more enlightened view on Aboriginal people, and indeed on humankind in general, Ramsay Smith still maintains that Aborigines were 'primitive'. Although he points out that 'primitive' did not mean degraded, he is firm in his judgement that it was an 'established and accepted fact' that 'the Australian is a primitive race'.[668] With this, Ramsay Smith did not only agree with Baldwin Spencer who wrote that Aborigines were 'the most archaic people extant',[669] but also with other authors in the *AE*. Ramsay Smith just like Baldwin Spencer believed that Aboriginal people would soon be 'extinct'.[670]

Thomas Tunbabin who wrote 'Tasmania, Aborigines of' in the *AE* begins his entry with the following sentence: 'When Tasmania was discovered it was inhabited by one of the most primitive races that have survived till modern times.' Tunbabin also maintains

---

[664] William Ramsay Smith, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 28–29.
[665] William Ramsay Smith, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 31.
[666] Ibid. p. 35.
[667] Walter Baldwin Spencer, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 15.
[668] William Ramsay Smith, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 20.
[669] Walter Baldwin Spencer, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 15.
[670] William Ramsay Smith, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 35.

that Tasmanian Aborigines were 'not of the same race as the Australian blackfellow' and that 'their [the Tasmanian Aboriginals', N.K.] culture was certainly of a lower type'.[671] Thus the Tasmanian Aborigines were attributed an even lower level in the assumed hierarchy of human beings. Hand in hand with the idea of primitiveness went the perception that living with Aboriginal people signified a 'loss'. The vocabulary used in 'Wild White Men' by A.H.C. is telling in this matter: people who lived with Aboriginal people were 'lost to civilization' and were in need of 'rescue'.[672] This attitude is also expressed in some of the biographical articles.[673] In this respect the *AE* agreed with the *Dictionary*, which also talked about white people having to be 'rescued' from Aborigines.[674] However, the notion that Aboriginal people were 'primitive' is largely absent from the *Dictionary*.

In the *AE* the alleged primitiveness was connected with the notion that the indigenous population had a great deal in common with apes. Ramsay Smith writes that 'it is allowed that the Australian aborigines exhibit the largest number of apelike characters'.[675] The comparison with animals was not left at that. In the entry 'Aborigines' there are many other formulations that put Australian Aborigines in relation to animals, there even is a mention of the 'previous habitat' of the 'Australian race'.[676] In the anonymous entry on 'Black Trackers' the formulation 'the use of aboriginals for this purpose' reminds very much of the description of an animal for production. 'Black Trackers' adds another aspect to the discourse on Aboriginal people being primitive. It says that 'under proper supervision the native police have behaved finely.'[677] The black trackers were seen as children who needed supervision.

Thus in the *AE* Aboriginal people are generally portrayed as primitive and immature. As some of the above quotes from the *AE* demonstrate, the indigenous population was also clearly depicted as the 'other'. It is striking how often Aboriginal

[671] Thomas Tunbabin, 'Tasmania, Aborigines of', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 539.
[672] A.H.C., 'Wild White Men', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 668–669. (This author is not included in the list of contributors.) The author also dismisses the notion of the noble savage: 'Unfortunately this conception of the "noble savage" is as fanciful as those of Pope and Rousseau.' (p. 667) A.H.C. does not explicitly replace the image of the 'noble savage' with another. However, his report on 'Wild White Men' suggests that he considered Aboriginal people simply as 'savages'.
[673] William Jackman 'succeeded in escaping' and Andrew Petrie 'rescued two "wild" white men'. See: 'Jackman, William', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 679. – A.H.C., 'Petrie, Andrew', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 290.
[674] Heaton, 'Aboriginals', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 7.
[675] William Ramsay Smith, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 16.
[676] Ibid. p. 17.
[677] 'Black Trackers', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 170.

people are labelled with the pronouns 'he' or 'they'.[678] This impression of Aboriginal people as the 'other' is strengthened by occasional formulations in which black and white are clearly separated. Baldwin Spencer says about string-making: 'So admirably is the string made that at a casual glance it appears just the same as a white man's'.[679] Ramsay Smith is giving a similar impression of black and white being different categories, although he weakens it slightly with an addition:

> *He [the Aboriginal, N.K.] will find abundance and live at ease where a white man would see nothing and starve to death. His power of tracking is due to observation and not to instinct, although the process may be to some degree unconscious; a white man can learn the art without very much difficulty.*[680]

In the *Dictionary*, such comparisons between black and white are not made. The division between 'us' and 'them' is much less distinct than in the *AE*. This is also shown in that the *Dictionary* makes a link between Aboriginal people and cricket, the sport that would become one of the great Australian national sports, being on the rise in Australia since it was first played on an international level in 1861.[681] In the *Dictionary*, there are two entries on Aboriginal cricketers, 'Aboriginal Cricketers' and 'Cricketers, Aboriginal' (referring back to 'Aboriginal Cricketers'). In 'Aboriginal Cricketers', although the entry starts with recalling a game of an Aboriginal team from Victoria losing against the Albert Club in Sydney, some victories of Aboriginal teams in England are referred to.[682] In the *AE's* article on cricket in contrast, Aboriginal players are only mentioned in one short paragraph.[683] In the *Dictionary*, Aboriginal people were portrayed more as a part of society and everyday life than in the *AE*. But the fact that Aboriginal cricketing appeared under a separate lemma in the *Dictionary* demonstrates that, although the distinction between black and white was less pronouncedly drawn, it was still undeniably there.

Both encyclopaedias contain generalisations, portraying Aborigines as bellicose and savage. Both either exclude the indigenous population from articles that do not explicitly deal with Aborigines, or assign them largely negative roles. However, only in the *AE* are Aboriginal people portrayed as primitive, immature and close to the animal kingdom. The construction of Aboriginal people as the 'other' is much stronger in the *AE*

[678] See for example: Walter Baldwin Spencer, 'Aborigines', *AE*, p. 16.
[679] Ibid. p. 33.
[680] William Ramsay Smith, 'Aborigines', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 29.
[681] See: Mandle, 'Cricket', p. 225.
[682] See: Heaton, 'Aboriginal Cricketers', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 1.
[683] Leslie Oswald Sheridan Poidevin and J.C. Davis, 'Cricket', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 332.

than in the *Dictionary*. Most tellingly, in the *Dictionary* there are no suggestions that the 'Aboriginal race' was doomed to disappear.

4.2.2 Portrayal of Chinese People

In contrast to many other publications, neither of the two encyclopaedias linked the Chinese with disease or immorality. However, in the unsigned *AE* article 'Immigration Restriction', the Chinese are not treated as human beings, but as mere labour forces. For the most part the entry deals with the policy, conferences and acts concerning the immigration of Chinese as well as other Asian, and so-called 'Kanaka', labour forces. The degradation of these people to mere labour forces is also expressed in the vocabulary used. The workers are 'obtained', 'shipped', 'imported' and 'introduced'. They are described as a 'batch' or 'large orders' and compared with 'cargo'.[684] This language is strongly reminiscent of a report on merchandise. The cold attitude towards Asian immigrants is only softened to a small degree by pointing out in the (also unsigned) entry 'Naturalization' that 'aliens and coloured persons, irrespective of nationality, suffer certain disabilities by or under the authority of federal and state legislation.' It is stressed that 'in most if not all cases of disability against aliens, treaty rights are respected.'[685]

Some of the dehumanising vocabulary used in the *AE* appears in the *Dictionary* too. The entry 'Chinese' starts with the following sentences: 'The first shipload of Chinese immigrants arrived in New South Wales; they were introduced at private cost, but the introduction of this race of men was much repudiated.'[686] However, Heaton's work is much less concerned with what the *AE* calls the 'Chinese problem'.[687] The amount of knowledge in the *Dictionary* concerned with Chinese and other Asian immigration to Australia is small. In effect, there is only the very brief entry 'Chinese' that is dealing with Chinese immigration. The article 'Immigration Restriction' in the *AE* in contrast is very extensive, consisting of more than ten pages. One might counter that this would have been in line with the general policy of the two encyclopaedias – the *Dictionary* entries are mostly short, whereas there are many long entries in the *AE* – however this cannot have been the main reason for the discrepancy of the two encyclopaedias. The *Dictionary* also contains an entry 'Immigrants', quite a long one in comparison with many other entries in the *Dictionary*. However it is not concerned with

[684] See for example: 'Immigration Restriction', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 646–648.
[685] 'Naturalization', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 178 and 179.
[686] Heaton, 'Chinese', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 54.
[687] 'Immigration Restriction', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 651.

Chinese immigration, but only deals with European immigration to Australia, with a clear focus on British and German immigrants. The article is to a large degree a list of when and where immigrants arrived in Australia, with only a small glimpse that immigration might become a problematic issue. Regarding a public meeting concerned with 'immigration and the discontinuance of transportation' the entry tells its readers:

> *The petitioners prayed 'That a more effective course might be pursued with a view to purchasing the largest possible portion of British labour with the produce of land sales,' so as to avoid the necessity of importing Indian labour, May, 1838.*[688]

However in general, immigration to Australia is described as essentially positive: 'An Immigration Committee appointed by the Council of New South Wales for the purpose of devising the best means to promote immigration.'[689]

The *Dictionary* also manages to give the Chinese a more personal face than the *AE*. Among the biographical entries of the *Dictionary's* first part there is a Chinese man, Kong Meng Lowe, a 'leading Chinese merchant in Melbourne'.[690] Certainly one single biographical entry is little, and the entry also emphasises that this man was 'a British subject by birth'.[691] However an article on a Chinese person was still more than what was contained in the *AE*. The entry shows that in Heaton's eyes it was possible to put a man of Chinese origin on the same level as other Australians. In the *AE* the Chinese are described in a generalising and negative way:

> *During the early gold-rush, when white labour was practically unobtainable, pastoralists renewed their efforts to obtain Chinese, but the gold-fever spread to the Chinese themselves. There were, too, other reasons for dissatisfaction with Chinese labour. During the voyage out the mortality rate was high. When they found their wages were below the normal standard of the colony, they rebelled; they were continually absconding; when they were brought before the courts, the lack of interpreters proved an insurmountable difficulty; and their morale suffered from the anti-social circumstances in which they lived.*[692]

Chinese people were said to be rebellious, disobedient and lacking morale.

In the *Dictionary* the attacks at Lambing Flat are mentioned in two articles ('Gold' and 'Riots'),[693] and condemned in strong language:

---

[688] Heaton, 'Immigrants', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 123.
[689] Ibid.
[690] Heaton, 'Kong Meng Lowe', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 108.
[691] Ibid.
[692] 'Immigration Restriction', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 647.
[693] Heaton, 'Gold', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 112. – Heaton, 'Riots', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 246.

> *Brutal onslaught on the Chinamen of Lambing Flat, and 'roll-up' of the diggers, amounting to 3,000 strong. They perpetrated many acts of violence and robbery, as tearing the goods and tents and maiming the Chinese in a fearful manner; June, 1861.*[694]

Significantly this condemnation is not put in the separate article on the Chinese, but in the general entry 'Riots' to which 'Chinese' refers. The attack on Chinese people at Lambing Flat is thus mentioned on equal terms with attacks on other people in Australia.

In the *AE*, the attacks are mentioned along with other attacks in 'Immigration Restriction', as well as in the entry 'Chronological Table'.[695] In 'Immigration Restriction' it is admitted that European miners were jealous of the success of Chinese gold diggers.[696] However, 'Immigration Restriction' is littered with assurances that the colonial governments dealt with attacks on Chinese diggers and thus solved these problems.[697] This ties in with the general defensive tone prevalent in the entry which culminates in the defence of the Australian government and its 'White Australia' policy. What the author of 'Immigration Restriction' thought might attract criticism in connection with Australia's 'White Australia' policy is generally dismissed as 'exaggerated' 'distorted' or 'false',[698] or simply blamed on a third party. The dictation test is said to have been 'forced on a reluctant Australian government by the colonial office for diplomatic reasons'.[699]

Whereas in the *AE*, Chinese people were portrayed as a commodity with no feelings, albeit rebellious, in the *Dictionary*, Chinese people were treated more as people. By including the attacks at Lambing Flat in 'Riots' it was admitted that they were human beings who could suffer, and through the biographical article on Kong Meng Lowe it was conceded that Chinese people were individuals, just like other people.

4.2.3 Portrayal of Women

Women play a very minor role in both the *Dictionary* and the *AE*. Both encyclopaedias contain only fifteen biographical entries on women. In the *Dictionary* two of these women (Lady Jane Franklin and Caroline Chisholm) are referred to twice, in

[694] Heaton, 'Riots', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 246.
[695] 'Immigration Restriction', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 651. – 'Chronological Table', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 260.
[696] 'Immigration Restriction', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 650.
[697] Ibid. pp. 650–651.
[698] Ibid. pp. 654.
[699] Ibid.

parts one and two of the encyclopaedia. Another four of the fifteen women appeared in the second part of the work.[700]

The reasons why women were given a place among the men are different in the two encyclopaedias. The majority of the women in the *AE* seem to have received an entry because of their professional achievements. The *AE* comprises female singers, actresses and writers, and even political activists. In the *Dictionary* only about a third of the women were included for professional reasons.[701] The professions of this minority of women comprehended a similar range as the ones in the *AE*, excluding political activists. The majority of women in the *Dictionary* seem to have been comprised in the encyclopaedia purely because of their relations to men, being the daughters, wives or mothers of what were considered notable men. Lady Dowling and Lady Forbes received a place in the *Dictionary* because they were the widows of knights, Madame Leichhardt because she was the mother of the explorer and Lady O'Connell because she was the 'heroic daughter of Governor Bligh'.[702] As a consequence there is very little knowledge about the life of women contained in the *Dictionary*. As many as five women are exclusively defined through their men. The entry on Lady Dowling reads as follows:

> *Dowling, Lady (knight's widow), Harriot [sic!] Mary, daughter of John Blaxland, Esq., of Newington, in Kent, and of Newington in New South Wales, and Member of the Legislative Council in Sydney, N.S.W. Married, first, 1816, Alexander Macdonald Ritchie, Esq., merchant of Calcutta; second, 1835, Sir James Dowling, Chief Justice of New South Wales, who died 1844. Resides in Sydney.*[703]

[700] For the *Dictionary* see: Australie (part 1, p. 61); Mrs Calvert (part 1, p. 32); Madame Carandini (part 1, pp. 35–36); Mrs. Caroline Chisholm (part 1, p. 38); Lady Harriot Mary Dowling (part 1, p. 57); "EVA" (part 1, p. 61); Lady Forbes (part 1, p. 71); Lady Jane Franklin (part 1, p. 74); Adelaide Eliza Ironside (part 1, pp. 100–101); Lady Mitchell (part 1, p. 139); Sarah Clarinda Thom (part 1, p. 139); Lady Bowen (part 2, p. 42); Mrs. Caroline Chisholm (part 2, pp. 54–55); Lady Franklin (part 2, p. 104); Madame Leichhardt (part 2, p. 129); Lady O'Connell (part 2, p. 193); Hon. Lady Robinson (part 2, p. 193). For the *AE* see: Marie Carandini, (vol. 1, p. 238); Margaret Catchpole (vol. 1, p. 242); Caroline Chisholm (vol. 1, pp. 255–256); Emily Matilda Heron (vol. 1, p. 612); Louisa Lawson (vol. 1, pp. 726–727); Dame Nellie Melba (vol. 2, pp. 52–53); Louisa Anne Meredith (vol. 2, p. 57); Maggie Moore (vol. 2, p. 140); Rebecca Oakes (vol. 2, p. 223); Eliza O'Flaherty (vol. 2, p. 225); Rosa Caroline Praed (vol. 2, p.324); Rose Scott (vol. 2, p. 430); Catherine Helen Spence (vol. 2, pp. 488–489); Nellie Stewart (vol. 2, pp. 497–498); Trucanini (vol. 2, pp. 596–597).

[701] Heaton, 'Australie', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 61. – Heaton, 'Calvert, Mrs', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 32. – Heaton, 'Carandini, Madame', *Dictionary*, part 1, pp. 35–36. – Heaton, 'Chisholm, Mrs. Caroline', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 38. – Heaton, 'Ironside, Adelaide Eliza', *Dictionary*, part 1, pp. 100–101.

[702] Heaton, 'Dowling, Lady Harriot Mary', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 57. – Heaton, 'Forbes, Lady', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 71. – Heaton, 'Leichhardt, Madame', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 129. – Heaton, 'O'Connell, Lady', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 193.

[703] Heaton, 'Dowling, Lady', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 57.

The only information the reader receives on Lady Dowling apart from her connections to men is that she 'resides in Sydney'. Although five of the women in the *Dictionary* were clearly included for professional reasons, men still played an important role in some of their entries. The writer 'Australie' is immediately identified as the daughter of Sir W. M. Manning and the wife of Henry Heron.[704] Other knowledge provided about the women in the *Dictionary* includes information about their professional life, their families and – true to Heaton's penchant – some curious events in the women's lives, even a love story is not missing.[705] However, knowledge on the men in the women's lives prevails.

In the *AE* only one woman is completely defined through her relations to men: Rebecca Oakes was included in the *AE* because she 'was the first white girl (and the second white child) born in Australia'.[706] Although the entry is about half a column long, the anonymous author manages to say absolutely nothing about the woman Rebecca Oakes, except when she was born and when she died. About half of the entry deals with Oakes' husband and the other half with her father and her sons. Apart from this exception, the biographical entries on women in the *AE* do provide the readers with knowledge about the women and their careers, reflecting the fact that the majority of women were chosen because of their professions. The families of these women, and in particular the men, were still made to look very significant. The great majority of the entries contain knowledge about the women's family background and/or their marriages. The (again anonymous) author of the entry on the writer and illustrator Louisa Anne Meredith managed to devote half of the entry to Meredith's husband and his family.[707] The system of references between the biographical entries in the *AE* supports the marginalising of women. Many biographical entries on women refer to articles on men, but only half of them also refer to the entries on women.[708]

---

[704] Heaton, '"Australie"', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 7.
[705] See: Heaton, '"EVA"', *Dictionary*, part 1, p. 61.
[706] 'Oakes, Rebecca', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 223.
[707] 'Meredith, Louisa Anne', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 57.
[708] 'Carandini, Marie' refers to 'Nathan, Isaac' which does not refer back. – 'Catchpole, Margaret' refers to 'Palmer, John', 'Caley, George', 'Rouse, Richard' and 'Reibey, Thomas'; only 'Caley, George' and 'Reibey, Thomas' refer back. – 'Chisholm, Caroline' refers to 'Donaldson, Sir Stuart Alexander' which refers back. – 'Heron, Emily Matilda' refers to 'Manning, Sir William Montagu' which does not refer back. – 'Moore, Maggie' refers to 'Williamson, James Cassius' which refers back. – 'Oakes, Rebecca' refers to 'Macarthur, John' which does not refer back. – 'Scott, Rose' refers to 'Rusden, George William' and 'Mitchell, David Scott'; only 'Mitchell, David Scott' refers back. – 'Trucanini' refers to 'Robinson, George Augustus' which refers back. (See: 'Carandini, Marie', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 238. – 'Nathan, Isaac', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 174. – 'Catchpole, Margaret', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 242. – 'Palmer, John', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 250–251. – 'Caley, George', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 229–230. – 'Rouse, Richard', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 402. – 'Reibey, Thomas', *AE*, vol. 2, p.

Women are marginalised in both encyclopaedias also in terms of articles other than biographical. In the *Dictionary* this is visible in general articles such as 'Heroes' or 'Obituary'. In the list of heroes, Heaton only included people who had received some sort of award for their deeds, which meant men. He does not seem to have found any woman worthy of the title 'hero'.[709] In the long list of obituaries – more than eleven pages – women are a very small minority. The women listed, with very few exceptions, were included not because Heaton had considered them notable personalities in themselves, but because they had been the wives or daughters of notable men. A handful of the women were listed because they died young, very old or in unusual circumstances.[710]

How important family and marriage were considered is highlighted by the existence of three articles dealing with marriage in the *Dictionary*.[711] The article 'Marriages in Australia during 1876' contains a list of wedding couples who were regarded as noteworthy. It is striking that for the bride, the name of the father is mentioned, whereas for the bridegroom, the father is, with one exception, not indicated. In some cases Heaton names the father of the bride, but not the bride herself.[712]

Regarding women, the only remarkable exception among the non-biographical articles in the *Dictionary* is 'Music, Opera, and Miscellaneous Entertainments'.[713] In this entry, female musicians are put on record alongside their male counterparts, as they were in the analogous *AE* entry 'Music'.[714] In the *AE*, as in the *Dictionary*, women play a minor role in most general articles. They are absent from the account of federation, which is portrayed as the achievement of notable male politicians only.[715] The entry 'Literature' does mention female writers, but only in passing. In many cases the names of the women writers are all that is indicated. The only female writer who receives a little more attention

---

378. – 'Chisholm, Caroline', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 255–256. – 'Donaldson, Sir Stuart Alexander', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 376–377. – 'Heron, Emily Matilda', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 612. – 'Manning, Sir William Montagu', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 32. – 'Moore, Maggie', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 140. – 'Williamson, James Cassius', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 670. – 'Oakes, Rebecca', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 223. – 'Macarthur, John', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 2–3. – 'Scott, Rose', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 430. – 'Rusden, George William', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 409. – 'Mitchell, David Scott', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 126. – 'Trucanini', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 596–597. – 'Robinson, George Augustus', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 392.)

[709] Heaton, 'Heroes', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 119.

[710] See: Heaton, 'Obituary', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 181–192.

[711] Heaton, 'Marriage', 'Marriage Bill' and 'Marriages in Australia during 1876', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 136–137.

[712] Heaton, 'Marriages in Australia during 1876', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 136–137.

[713] Heaton, 'Music, Opera, and Miscellaneous Entertainments', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 167–168.

[714] William Walford Thorpe, 'Music', *AE*, vol. 2, pp. 160–170.

[715] 'Federation', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 444– 452.

is Barbara Baynton (1857–1929).[716] May Gibbs (1877–1969) is missing entirely. Given this marginalisation it is not surprising that the entry 'Cost of Living' mentions the calories requirements for men, but not for women.[717]

The difference between the *Dictionary* and the *AE* regarding their treatment of women is thus a matter of priorities. Whereas in the *Dictionary* the men surrounding the women are in the foreground, in the *AE* the professions of the women and hence the women themselves are more prominent. The idealising of women as mothers and homemakers in the years after federation is not reflected in a difference between the *Dictionary* and the *AE*; but in the *AE*, the families, and in particular the husbands and fathers, are portrayed as important parts of the female identity. The biographical entries in both encyclopaedias are so few that the main characteristic regarding the treatment of women is clearly female marginalisation in both encyclopaedias. In comparing the two encyclopaedias one can only find small hints, such as the biographical articles on female political activists, that indicate that women had increased their political rights since the *Dictionary* had been produced.

The shifts in the position and portrayal of Aboriginal and Chinese people, and their further devaluation in the process of Australian nation-building, were turned into general knowledge by the *AE*. Through the publication of the *AE* the views that Aborigines were the primitive 'other' and that Chinese were inhuman were now part of recognised general knowledge. Since these shifts in the treatment of Aborigines and Chinese people were intrinsic parts of the Australian nation building project, significant aspects of this project had thus been frozen in the monument of the *AE*. Although the notion that women were mothers and homemakers was not stronger in the *AE* than in the *Dictionary*, the marginalisation of women and the importance of men for female identity were transformed into fixed general knowledge by both encyclopaedias.

4.3 An Invitation to Browse?

How do the *Dictionary* and the *AE* compare in regard to their visual appearance? What was presented to the readers' eyes? The bindings of the two works are similar in

[716] Archibald Thomas Strong, 'Literature', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 745.
[717] George Handley Knibbs, 'Cost of Living', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 316–317.

style, although different in many details. Whereas the *Dictionary* has a wine-red binding, the *AE's* binding is dark green. And whereas the *Dictionary's* title is on the cover of the work, the writing on the *AE* is exclusively situated on the spine. However, the writing of both encyclopaedias is kept in gold, giving them an air of sophistication. The bindings of both encyclopaedias include gold ornaments. The *AE's* title is surrounded by floral decorations, and the *Dictionary's* front cover includes a picture of a sandglass framed by flowers and other plants. On the top of the sandglass, the year 1542 is inscribed, and on the bottom 1879, an indication of the period the work was to cover. The flowers framing the sandglass are Australian. They include drawings of the emblematic Waratah, Sturt's Desert Pea, and a Grass Tree. The *AE* features an embossed map of Australia on the front cover instead of writing. The *Dictionary* was modest: it was an *Australian Dictionary of Dates*. The *AE* was much more ambitious: it was a symbol for the Australian nation as a whole.

What did the readers encounter if they opened the encyclopaedias at random? The most striking difference between the two works from a visual perspective lies in the numerous illustrations included in the *AE*. In the *Dictionary* there are none.[718] The illustrations in the *AE* range from small black-and-white drawings to colour plates taking up a double page. Apart from drawings, the *AE* also features photos and many maps. The great majority of the pictures illustrate entries on animals and plants, but the number of maps showing Australia is also striking. Among many others, there is a map showing Australia's Artesian waters,[719] one pointing out various areas of exploration,[720] others illustrating Australia's rainfall,[721] and photographic maps showing Australia in a relief perspective.[722] The *AE* also includes maps showing parts of Australia, for example Botany Bay or Canberra.[723] The common aspect of the maps seems to be the gauging of Australia in all its aspects. The maps record the geographical, geological, climatological, historical, political and economical characteristics of Australia. They contribute to the *AE's* nation building project: as Karl Schlögel pointed out, the map is a concrete way in

[718] The only exception (apart from the picture on the front cover) is pictures in an advertisement at the back of the *Dictionary*.
[719] 'Map of Australia Showing the Extent of the Known Artesian Basins', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 77.
[720] Map on Australian exploration (no caption), *AE*, vol. 1, p. 90.
[721] 'Map showing net Rainfall', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 504. – Australian map with regions of rainfall (no caption), *AE*, vol. 1, p. 505.
[722] 'Relief Model of Australia and Tasmania' and 'Relief Map of Australia and Tasmania, Showing Trend Lines', *AE*, vol. 1, between pp. 530 and 531.
[723] 'Botany Bay (from Atlas Illustrating Cook's Voyage).', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 188. – 'Official Plan of the Capital City', *AE*, vol. 1, p. 235.

which people can imagine their community of the nation.[724] This nation-centred way of illustrating the entries in the *AE* ties in with the way both volumes of the *AE* start off, with a symbol for the Australian nation – volume one with the coat of arms of the Commonwealth and volume two with the map of Australia with Europe inscribed.

In the *Dictionary* the entries are generally shorter than in the *AE*. Most of the *Dictionary's* articles are very short, some entries consisting of just a few lines. There are double pages that contain as much as sixteen individual entries, plus some 'empty' entries referring to other entries.[725] 'Empty' entries are quite common in both encyclopaedias, in the *AE* even more so. There are a smaller number of extensive articles in the *Dictionary* of considerable length. The exceptional entry 'Volunteer, and Other Forces' takes up almost sixteen pages and the entry 'Ministries' nearly 21 pages.[726] These long entries are almost exclusively made up by lists or statistics. 'Volunteer, and Other Forces' for the most part consists of a list of troops and high-rank military personnel, and 'Ministries' is a list of ministries and their members. Some of the lists incorporated in the *Dictionary* contain sub-lists. The entry and list 'Australian Navigators' features a sub-list for James Cook, naming events in connection with his crew on one of his voyages.[727] Many of the longer *Dictionary* entries that are not strictly speaking lists have a list-like appearance. 'Port Phillip', although it gives a history of the place, has the look of a list, itemising individual events, keeping them separate from one another by graphical means, with the first line of each of the itemised text blocks hanging.[728]

Opening the *AE*, the reader gets a very different impression. The entries are in general not only longer than in the *Dictionary*, but also of a different nature. Lists are not a prominent feature of the *AE*. The entries mainly consist of continuous text, broken up here and there by quotes, illustrations, bibliographies, tables and statistics. In the *AE*

[724] Karl Schlögel, *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit: Über Zivilisationsgeschichte und Geopolitik* (Hanser, München and Wien 2003) p. 199.
[725] Heaton, *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 62–63. – This and the following statistical information was gained through the analysis of twenty randomly picked double pages in the *Dictionary*. The *AE* was analysed the same way. The following pages were analysed: Heaton, *Dictionary*, part 1, pp. 24–25, 48–49, 116–117, 180–181, 192–193, 202–203, 232–ADDENDA, and part 2, pp. 32–33, 62–63, 90–91, 136–137, 154–155, 160–161, 184–185, 212–213, 222–223, 256–257, 270–271, 286–287, 306–307. – *AE*, vol. 1, pp. 22–23, 66–67, 164–165, 326–327, 432–433, 448–449, 564–565, 670 plus illustration, 726–727, 746–747, and vol 2, pp. 58–59, 86–87, illustration plus 197, 242 plus illustration, 346–347, 432–433, 512–513, 594–595, 680–681, 714–715.
[726] Heaton, 'Volunteer, and Other Forces', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 287–303. – Heaton, 'Ministries', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 141–162.
[727] Heaton, 'Australian Navigators', *Dictionary*, part 2, p. 32.
[728] Heaton, 'Port Phillip', *Dictionary*, part 2, pp. 210–215.

statistics as well as numbers and dates in general seem less prominent because such kind of information is surrounded by other types of text. The *Dictionary*, especially in the second part, appears as a great amassment of numbers and dates.

If a user of the *Dictionary* opened the encyclopaedia on a random double page, he most likely encountered an inventory-like text, consisting either of small entries or long lists. The double page would have been abounding with dates, and – in case the double page was in the second part of the *Dictionary* – with numbers and statistics. The *Dictionary* with its character of an inventory and its lack of illustrations would have seemed very dry and not very inviting for browsing. The inventory-like character of the work confirms that unlike the *AE*, the *Dictionary* was not a Konversationslexikon. The *AE* with its variety of texts and its illustrations, inviting its readers to browse, was much more adept for that purpose.

4.4 Conclusion

Between 1879 and 1925/26 there was clearly a change in the way general knowledge was presented in Australia. In 1879 Heaton had disseminated general knowledge by means of an inventory. Its main aim was to gauge the Australian colonies and people with numbers and dates. Almost half a century later, general knowledge was presented to the Australian people in the form of a Konversationslexikon. Although the producers of the *AE* still used gauging methods as well, generally their approach of presenting knowledge was different. A variety of different texts, illustrated with beautiful drawings and photos, was to deliver a positive picture of the Australian nation. Whereas the *Dictionary* was open to negatively connotated entries, such articles were banned from the *AE*. Whereas the *Dictionary* was national only in its macrostructure, the *AE* was national down to its microstructure. That the *AE* portrayed Aborigines and Chinese people as the 'other' shows that the highly exclusive nature of the nation had been adopted. At the same time the *AE* imported this discriminating attitude into general knowledge.

These differences in the way general knowledge was presented do not mean that the *Dictionary* was not intent on nation building. Both encyclopaedias worked on the construction of the Australian nation, albeit at very different stages of the process. The *Dictionary* was part of the imagining stage in which the territory of the new nation was still in the process of being marked out. As pointed out earlier, in the nineteenth century statistics often served to give the abstract entity of the nation a concrete body. The

imagined territory of the nation was still vague in the time of the *Dictionary*, and attitudes such as the biological cringe still possible. The *AE* was part of the later step of nation building, the promotion of the Australia nation. The ideology of the *AE* is visible through omissions of knowledge just as much as through inclusions. One could hold that the *Dictionary* was contributing to the foundation of the Australian nation on which the producers of the *AE* later built their monument.

5 A Welcome Advertisement for Australia

George Robertson wrote that they 'lost money "like water" on the *AE*.'[729] But with the exception of Britain, the sale of the *AE* was successful. Indeed it went so well that the *AE* was reprinted several times. In 1927 a revised edition of the work was published. According to Richard Nile and David Walker, the production of the *AE* reached 10,000 copies.[730] In September 1925 Robertson wrote to H.L. White of Belltrees:

> *You will be glad to hear that out of an edition of 5,600 copies of vol. 1 we have only 400 left. The orders taken since publication have not been numerous, but during the years the job was on the stocks we pegged away, and accumulated over 4000 of them.*[731]

According to Robertson and W.G. Cousins, orders for the *AE* came in from all over the world.[732] Why the *AE* sold poorly in Britain is not clear, but Jose seemed to think the British were simply not given the chance to buy it. In 1927, he wrote to Fred Shenstone: 'a good many people seem to want copies, and cannot procure them; is there any way of buying them in London?'[733]

Robertson had made a large investment in the *AE*, and he had never expected it to return the money, let alone bring him profit. It was more a labour of love. He wrote: 'I landed in Sydney with 10/1 in my pocket, and the Encyclopaedia is my thankoffering. It never can be made to return its cost – not in my lifetime, anyhow.'[734] The *AE* was supposed to be a gift to Australia, a national undertaking. Therefore its success cannot be measured in financial profit, but only in terms of its usage. Did Australians trust the *AE* and use it? Did people overseas trust and use it?

Hundreds of letters of acknowledgement sent to Robertson (who seems to have been regarded as the person responsible for the *AE*) shed light on these questions. As a list in the papers of Angus & Robertson shows, Robertson sent out over 500 complimentary copies of the encyclopaedia. Of those, Robertson presented around 400 to museums, libraries, universities and government offices, but also to other publishers and booksellers, journals, schools, colleges, clubs and associations, banks, military officers,

[729] Letter from Robertson on 21 August 1925 to C.H. Peters, ML: MS 314/243.
[730] Nile and Walker, 'The Mystery', p. 250.
[731] Letter from Robertson on 3 September 1925 to H.L. White, ML: MS 314/243.
[732] Letter from Robertson on 6 September 1927 to Fredk. Watson, ML: MS 314/243. – Letter from W.G. Cousins on 21 September 1927 to Jose, ML: MS 314/41.
[733] Letter from Jose on 15 June 1927 to Fred Shenstone, ML: MS 314/41. See also: Letter from Jose on 18 August 1927 to Cousins, ML: MS 314/41.
[734] Letter from Robertson on 25 August 1925 to H.W. Armit, ML: MS 314/242.

priests and more.[735] The remaining copies went to contributors of the *AE*.[736] According to Robertson's secretary Wiley, Robertson's generosity was carefully calculated:

> *He was foresighted enough to see that the copies to Universities & Scientific Bodies would as he said, be like "Casting Bread upon the Waters etc", & be a splendid advertisement for A&R, and so it proved – for many inquiries from foreign countries came for Books about Australia especially on Science & Natural History.*[737]

Most encyclopaedias were sent to Australian addresses, particularly many in Sydney, but there were also around 60 going to Britain, two dozen to the United States of America, more than a dozen to New Zealand and some to France (2), Papua (1), South Africa (1), Italy (1) and Switzerland (1). This shows that the *AE* was also designed to impress readers overseas. The complimentary copies resulted in hundreds of thank-you letters. They were not restricted to simple acknowledgements but also revealed what the writers thought about the *AE*, in what way they used the encyclopaedia and what they drew from it. Robertson had chosen well-educated people in leading positions for complimentary copies, but the letters of acknowledgement also give clues about a more general readership of the *AE*.

Robertson sent copies of the *AE* for review to the Commonwealth Library in Melbourne, the University of Sydney library, the Public Library of New South Wales and to numerous Australian and British newspapers.[738] He was dissatisfied with the reviews the *AE* received in the press. In August 1925 Robertson wrote to the *Bulletin's* S.H. Pryor:

> *The Sydney Morning Herald gave it three inches (with a sting in the tail) on the Women's page. The Evening News and the World's News (!) are the only papers in Sydney that have tried to give it justice. And, so far as I know, they never prate about Australia for the Australians.*
>
> *Had our Encyclo. been published in America you would all have fallen over yourselves to boost it. As it is, our best reviews will come from New Zealand and South Africa!*[739]

[735] 'Complimentary Copies of vol. II Australian Encyclopaedia', ML: MS 314/242. As the thank-you letters in ML MS 314/242 and ML MS 314/243 show, Robertson had also sent out copies of volume one.
[736] The *AE* lists 120 authors. See: 'Contributors', *AE*, vol. 1, pp. vii–ix. – 'Supplementary List of Contributors', *AE*, vol. 2, p. 749.
[737] Wiley Reminiscences, ML: MS 5238 (pp. 554–555).
[738] 'Australian Review Copies' and 'The Australian Encyclopaedia has been mailed for review to the following newspapers', ML: MS 314/242.
[739] Letter from Robertson on 21 August 1925 to S.H. Pryor, ML: MS 314/243.

Robertson felt the *AE* had fallen victim to what later became known as the 'cultural cringe'. His dissatisfaction led Caroline Jones to believe that the *AE* received 'poor press'.[740] But letters by the well-known artist Neville Cayley[741] (who provided illustrations for the *AE*) and by the notable entomologist Robin John Tillyard (who wrote for the *AE*) suggest that the encyclopaedia was well received in the press. Tillyard wrote to Robertson, just a couple of months after Robertson's letter above: 'I expect you are very pleased with the reviews of vol. I. of the Encyclopaedia.'[742] In 1928, Cayley told Robertson: 'The reviews I have seen have all highly praised the production.'[743] Angus & Robertson employee W.G. Cousins talked of 'dashed good press notices in over 30 papers' in Britain.[744] Possibly Robertson had just wished for longer reviews. The animosity between Robertson and the *Bulletin* editors might have partly been responsible for Robertson's furious tone in his letter to Pryor.

The numerous thank-you letters that came in from Australia and from overseas prove that the *AE* was extremely well-received in educated circles all around the world. The letters arriving from Australia with very few exceptions only had the highest praise for the *AE*. Even taking into account that Robertson might had thrown away letters containing criticism, the overwhelming number of approving letters, around 350, cannot be dismissed.[745] Some writers reported mistakes they had found in the volumes, but Robertson seems to have asked them to do so. Jones, disregarding Robertson's invitation to report mistakes, interprets these letters as disapproval of the *AE*.[746] But with few exceptions the mistakes did not lead anybody to speak ill of the *AE*. The encyclopaedia was regarded as trustworthy. Only four letters among the preserved thank-you letters contain significant criticism, two of them being complaints about who had received a biographical entry in the *AE* and who had not. It seems as if one of these two complaints had to do with the offence the writer of the letter took that his own name had not been included in the encyclopaedia.[747] Another letter talked about 'serious errors' in the *AE*,

[740] Jones, *Australian Imprint*, p. 302.
[741] Neville Cayley's son, Neville W. Cayley, was a famous ornithological artist who also contributed illustrations for the *AE*.
[742] Letter from Robin John Tillyard on 13 October 1925 to Jose, ML: ZML A7273.
[743] Letter from Neville Cayley on 27 August 1928 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[744] Letter from W.G. Cousins on 26 July 1927 to Jose, SLVIC: PA 98/112, box 4.
[745] This number remains large even if one takes into account that some people wrote to Angus & Robertson several times.
[746] Jones, *Australian Imprint*, p. 311.
[747] Letter on 11 November 1925 (signature illegible) to George Robertson, ML: MS 314/242. See also: Letter from T.W. Henry on 17 August 1925 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/243.

but still called the encyclopaedia 'your great book'.[748] Ernest Whitfeld, not a recipient of a complimentary copy, had a whole series of complaints. One of them is interesting. Whitfeld wrote:

> *It is difficult to account for the neglect to include some subjects. There are, for instance, no entries relating to floods and fires. Obviously the Encyclopaedia couldn't give all the big floods and fires, and no one would expect it to do so, but I submit that the more memorable of these disasters should have had a place. One wonders whether mining catastrophes are to be dealt with. It will be strange indeed if there is to be no record of the big disasters such as those at Bulli, Mount Kembla and Bellbird, to mention only three. Anyway there is no mention of either the Bulli or the Bellbird explosion in the first volume.*
>
> *Crime is another subject-heading for which one will look in vain. There is altogether too much one-sidedness in dealing with this subject. Bushrangers and bushranging have received full recognition, and properly so, and it would therefore be interesting to know on what grounds the Editor justifies the exclusion of such criminal celebrities as Deeming, Butler, Knatchbull and others. And who wouldn't expect to find Bully Hayes among the subjects of any Australian Encyclopaedia?*
>
> *The Dean case, also, acquired sufficient fame to have warranted inclusion, and it is passing strange to find no record of J.T. Griffin, the Queensland Police Magistrate and Gold Commissioner, who murdered and robbed his own gold escort in 1868. The work is lamentably incomplete in this respect.*[749]

In short, Whitfield noticed that the *AE* avoided negatively connotated entries. He does not seem to have drawn the conclusion though that this was done on purpose to put the Australian nation in a positive light.

The most common judgments of the *AE* included attributes such as 'splendid' (or 'magnificent' or 'great'), 'useful', 'valuable' and 'reliable' (or 'accurate'). The praise for the encyclopaedia also included attributes such as 'interesting', 'comprehensive' (or 'complete'), 'indispensable' and many more. The recipients of the complimentary copies were generally very impressed with the quality of the plates contained in the *AE*, as was artist Julian Ashton.[750] The following excerpt from the letter by Reverend James Colwell is a good example of the general tenor of the letters:

> *Everything I have seen in connection with it [the* AE*, N.K.] pleases me greatly. You and those associated with you deserve the heartiest congratulations for the fine result of what I think to be a great & courageous undertaking. As I have often told you, so I say again: you are creating a literature for Australia & making a name for your firm which will be enduring. If you want to know what I think of the get up & the literary parts of the work I think them deserving of*

[748] Letter from Isaac Selby on 28 October 1925 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[749] Letter from Ernest Whitfeld, '"The Australian Encyclopaedia". A Purchaser's Criticism' (no addressee, no date), ML: MS 314/243.
[750] Letter from Julian Ashton on 2 August 1928 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242. See also: Letter from Charles Barrett on 26 August 1925 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.

> *the highest praise. I suppose blemishes may be discovered here & there, for where is the book without a blemish? But on the whole it strikes me as being reliable & most useful. Again I congratulate you on the pluck & public spirit which have prompted you to render this great service to Australia.*[751]

In addition to the above mentioned words of praise, this letter indicates two more significant judgements very commonly found in the letters. (1) Many letter writers told Robertson what 'a credit' the *AE* was to himself and to Angus & Robertson.[752] Like Colwell, many others regarded the *AE* to be a successful part of Angus & Robertson's well-known effort to create a literature for Australia. There is a lot of talk about Robertson's (and his firm's) 'public spirit' and courage. Solicitor and politician Thomas Hughes, strong supporter of Federation and once lord mayor of Sydney,[753] told Robertson that the *AE* was 'so fine a work which will stand not only for the literary value of its content, but also as a further evidence of the enterprise & courage for which your house is deservedly celebrated.'[754] (2) Numerous letter writers considered the *AE* to be a 'service to Australia'. It was commonly recognised that the *AE* was designed as a patriotic enterprise, and as such it was welcomed warmly. Scientist and Professor J.B. Cleland of the University of Adelaide wrote:

> *Let me express my appreciation of your kindness in forwarding me the 2nd volume of the Encyclopaedia. May I again congratulate you on the excellency of the work and the extent of its scope. We all, I think, recognise also the patriotic motives that led to the undertaking of this work and it must be only pleasing to you to see it brought to such a successful conclusion.*[755]

Many recipients of the complimentary copies held that 'Australians should be grateful to your firm for its enterprise in having published [the *AE*, N.K.]',[756] and others regarded the *AE* as 'a much needed publication'. W.H. Ifould, the principal librarian of the Public Library of New South Wales, praised the *AE* as 'a reference book which for general purposes is by far the most needed and most valuable which our country has produced.'[757] Some writers seemed to think that the *AE* was the first Australian

---

[751] Letter from James Colwell on 7 September 1925 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[752] See for example: Letter from H.H. Dare on 26 August 1925 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson Ltd.', ML: MS 314/242.
[753] Peter Spearitt, 'Hughes, Sir Thomas (1863–1930)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography* (Australian National University, online edition 2006). (www.adbonline.anu.edu/biogs/A090718b.htm, accessed 7 June 2007.)
[754] Letter from Thomas Hughes on 11 November 1926 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson', ML: MS 314/243.
[755] Letter from J.B. Cleland on 8 November 1926 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson', ML: MS 314/242.
[756] Letter from George Forbes on 24 October 1926 to Angus & Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[757] Letter from W.H. Ifould on 21 August 1925 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson Ltd.', ML: MS 314/243. See also: Letter from W.A.S. Anderson on 24 August 1925 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson', ML: MS 314/41. – Letter from E.J. Forbes on 1 September 1925 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson Ltd.', ML: MSS 314/242.

encyclopaedia: 'You have, as head of the publishing house of A&R, very much indeed to be proud of, in that the first Australian Encyclo should be presented to Australian readers by your firm.'[758] There were also writers who were very aware that the positive portrayal of Australia in the *AE* would promote Australia in other places of the world. As J.M. Forsyth of Dymock's Book Arcade in Sydney expressed it: 'What better advertisement could Australia have'.[759] Others again appreciated the encyclopaedia's potential to 'encourage an Australian National spirit'.[760] This encouragement, this advertisement for the Australian nation, Robertson had freely sent all around the world. His main goal in giving away the complimentary copies might have been to spread this Australian national spirit, and only in second instance to promote his business as such.

The publication of the *AE* was not only considered a reason for pride for Angus & Robertson, but also for Australia itself. Many writers maintained that the *AE* was a 'work Australia may well be proud of'.[761] The encyclopaedia was interpreted as having been produced *for* Australia, but also *by* Australia as a nation. This pride might also have had to do with the Australian cultural cringe. The letters show that numerous people were positively surprised that a work such as the *AE* could be produced in Australia. R.T. Foster of the Register Office in Adelaide told Robertson: 'Examining it [the *AE*, N.K.], my wonder grows that it should have been possible in Australia to carry to a successful conclusion so magnificent a publishing enterprise.'[762] Some writers felt it was necessary to point out that the *AE* was just as good as productions in other countries, especially in England and the United States of America. Frederick John Broomfield, a contributor to the *AE* and once a sub-editor for the *Bulletin*,[763] wrote: 'the totality of the volume is everything one could desire, even from the presses and publishing houses of the Old, and the American edition of the New, World.'[764] It seems that the publication of the *AE* in Australia boosted the self-confidence of some of the writers. Professor J.B. Cleland

[758] Letter from C.H. Lloyd to Robertson (no date), ML: MS 314/243. See also: Letter from Frederick John Broomfield on 25 August 1925 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[759] Letter from J.M. Forsyth on 3 February 1926 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[760] Letter from Bailding Ltd. (letter writer not identifiable) on 11 June 1927 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson Ltd.', ML: MS 314/242.
[761] Letter from W. Benson on 22 October 1926 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson', ML: MS 314/242. See for example also: Letter from W.S. Campbell on 20 October 1926 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[762] Letter from R.T. Foster on 12 September 1927 to Robertson, ML: MSS 314/242.
[763] See: B.G. Andrews and Ann-Mari Jordens, 'Broomfield, Frederick John (Fred) (1860–1941)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography* (Australian National University, online edition 2006). (www.adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A070441b.htm, accessed 7 June 2007.)
[764] Letter from Frederick John Broomfield on 25 August 1925 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.

remarked: 'It is an additional pleasure to note that the work is purely Australian and we are proud of it.'[765]

The letters of acknowledgement received from Britain and other parts of the world, such as the United States of America and New Zealand, were written in a very similar spirit to the Australian letters. The only real difference in judgement is that the *AE's* significance for the Australian nation was generally not acknowledged in letters from overseas. But there were writers from overseas who recognised and commended the *AE's* value for the Australian nation. New Zealanders expressed their wish that their nation receive a similar work: 'I hope you will some day come across the Tasman and do the same service for New Zealand.'[766]

Both the writers in Australia and overseas saw many ways in which they could profit from the *AE*. It is striking how many recipients in Australia seemed to enjoy the *AE* as an entertainment that gave them 'many hours of pleasure'.[767] The *AE* was not only used as a reference work that could be consulted if one had a specific question, but also as reading material for leisure hours. There is ample evidence in the letters for both uses of the *AE*, consultation and leisurely reading.[768] Isaac Selby assured Robertson that he would 'read every article',[769] and F.A. McNeill, a zoologist from the Australian Museum, planned to read the *AE* 'conscientiously from cover to cover'.[770] Bookseller and publisher A.H. Spencer complained tongue-in-cheek 'the damn thing kept me from bed till 1 o'clock this morning'.[771] The letters from Britain and other countries that remark on whether the *AE* was consulted or read as a whole suggest that just as in Australia, the *AE* was used in both ways. Reading the encyclopaedia as a whole, readers were confronted with what the producers of the *AE* considered to be the entire nation.

---

[765] Letter from J.B. Cleland on 4 September 1925 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson', ML: MS 314/242.
[766] Letter from Hugh Vickerman on 25 October 1928 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/243. See also: Letter from D.A. Strachan on 11 December 1926 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/243.
[767] See for example: Letter from R.G. Linehan on 7 December 1926 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/243. – Letter from A.H. Spencer on 5 September 1925 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/243. – Letter from Hugh Black on 9 April 1930 to Angus & Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[768] For evidence for consultation of the *AE* see for example: Letter from A.H. Charteris on 10 June 1927 to Angus & Robertson, ML: MSS314/242. – Letter from A.G. Campbell on 30 October 1926 to Angus & Robertson, ML: MS 314/242. – Letter from Phyllis F. North on 4 November 1926 to Angus & Robertson, ML: MS 314/243.
[769] Letter from Isaac Selby on 21 November 1926 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/243.
[770] Letter from F.A. McNeill on 24 August 1925 to Angus & Robertson, ML: MS 314/243.
[771] Letter from A.H. Spencer to Angus & Robertson (no date), ML: MS 314/243.

Some readers of the *AE*, in particular librarians and authors, used it as a replacement for original research. The author Aidan de Brune told Robertson:

> *I am looking forward to making the very fullest use of the volumes in my work of fiction writing. Up to date I have had to spend many weary hours at the Public Library, and Mitchell Library searching for information that I now shall have ready to my hands.*[772]

Kenneth Binns, parliamentary and national librarian, asserted: 'Speaking as a librarian, the Australian Encyclopaedia is a godsend as a labour saving device'.[773] But it was not only librarians and authors who trusted and used the *AE* in their daily work, but also members of Australian government departments and commissions. The Secretary of the Federal Capital Commission wrote: 'You will be glad to know that the Federal Capital Commission has already found this publication of very considerable value for office reference'.[774] The government statistician T. Waites said that 'the volume will be very useful for official reference',[775] and a letter from the Prime Minister's Department assured Angus & Robertson that the *AE* was of 'immense value'.[776]

As the letters from Britain, the United States of America and other countries show, non-Australians above all saw the *AE* as a source to learn about a country of which they had only limited knowledge. For the American Marie Conway Dewles the *AE* appears to have opened up a whole new world:

> *It is, I am sure, of great value to Australia, which it reveals to many for the first time in a truly comprehensive and adequate manner. I am fascinated with it – I have been poring over it ever since it came. It is as if I were becoming acquainted with a new world for the first time. Australia is becoming near, one begins to realize that a vast country it is, how interesting, vital, beautiful. And such flowers! (…) Americans who know anything at all about it are immensely interested in Australia, and I am very glad and proud to have something like the Australian Encyclopaedia to show my friends.*[777]

Dewles' countryman F.D. Waterman even claimed the *AE* represented 'the first really authentic information on Australia that they [his family and associates, N.K.] have ever had'.[778] Just like these Americans, the medical and scientific publishers J.&A. Churchill

[772] Letter from Aidan de Brune on 14 September 1927 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[773] Letter from Kenneth Binns on 21 September 1925 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[774] Letter from C.S. Daley on 3 September 1927 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson Ltd.', ML: MS 314/242.
[775] Letter from T. Waites on 26 October 1926 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson Ltd.', ML: MS 314/243.
[776] Letter from the Prime Minister's Department (signature illegible) on 16 October 1925 to Angus & Robertson, ML: MS 314/243.
[777] Letter from Marie Conway Dewles on 26 January 1928 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson', ML: MS 314/243.
[778] Letter from F.D. Waterman on 22 November 1928 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/243.

in London pointed out that they learnt new things about Australia from the *AE*: 'Living [on, N.K.] this side of the World, we notice pictures of animal and insect life which are quite fresh to us.'[779] It seems that many letter writers agreed with J.W. Allen (of the telegram company Longmans Green & Co. Limited in London) that the *AE* could be trusted to contain 'correct information about matters Australian'.[780]

One can hold that generally, the receivers of the complimentary copies of the *AE* trusted the work, valued it highly and used it in their daily life, at home as well as at work. One could object that these people might have been manipulated in their judgement by being given free copies. But the response to the *AE* was so overwhelmingly positive that the free copies are not enough to explain it. The positive responses of the recipients of complimentary copies are mirrored in the fact that the *AE* was quoted and referred to in numerous publications for many years after the *AE* was first published. Until at least 1950 the *AE* was quoted or referred to almost yearly – sometimes several times a year – in historical, economic, geographical, scientific, linguistic, religious, political and biographical publications. These included publications in Australia, as well as abroad, especially in Britain and the United States, but also in other countries such as Germany. The majority of these works were of an academic nature.[781] Fiction, political works and

[779] Letter from J.&A. Churchill on 8 December 1927 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson', ML: MS 314/242.
[780] Letter from J.W. Allen on 17 December 1926 to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson', ML: MS 314/242.
[781] For Australia see for example: Sidney J. Baker, *The Australian Language* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1945) pp. 47 and 66. – H.H. Dare, *Water Conservation in Australia* (Simmons Limited, Sydney 1939) p. 7. – Alfred Joyce, *A Homestead History: Being the Reminiscences and Letters of Alfred Joyce of Plaistow and Norwood, Port Phillip, 1843-1864*, with introduction and notes by G.F. James (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1942) p. 181. – John Andrew La Nauze, *Political Economy in Australia: Historical Studies*, vol. B (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1949) p. 23. – For Britain see for example: M.A., 'Names given by Cook' ('The Record'), *The Geographical Journal*, 111 (1/3), 1948, p. 143. – M.A., 'Rev. W.B. Clarke, the Australian Geologist' ('The Monthly Record'), *The Geographical Journal*, 108 (1/3), 1946, p. 121. – W.H. Hancock, *Australia* (Ernest Benn Ltd., London 1930) p. 319. – A.R.H., 'Nautical Time and Civil Date', *The Geographical Journal*, 86 (2), 1935, p. 157. – Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, vol. 5 (Eyre and Spottiswoode, London 1943) p. 132. – J. Holland Rose et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the British Empire*, vol. 7 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1933) pp. 608, 619, 621. – Edward Shann, *An Economic History of Australia* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1930) pp. 3, 23, 28, 39, 58, 65, 119, 126 etc. – For the United States of America see for example: C. Hartley Grattan (ed.), *Australia* (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1947) pp. 421 and 424. – Paul Knaplund, *The British Empire, 1815–1939* (Harper & Brothers, New York and London 1941) p. 822. – George Mackaness, *The Life of Vice-Admiral William Bligh* (Farrar & Rinehart, New York and Toronto 1931) p. 364. – Stephen Winsor Reed, *The Making of Modern New Guinea* (The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia 1943) p. 301. – Clifford M. Zierer, 'The Australian Iron and Steel Industry as a Functional Unit', *Geographical Review*, 30 (4), 1940, p. 656. – Clifford M. Zierer, 'Broken Hill: Australia's Greatest Mining Camp', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 30 (2), 1940, p. 86. – For other countries see for example: Wilhelm Gerloff and Franz Meisel (eds.), *Handbuch der Finanzwissenschaft*, vol. 3 (Mohr, Tübingen 1928) p. 465.

various other types of writing drew on the *AE*,[782] and another encyclopaedia, Fred John's *An Australian Biographical Dictionary* from 1934, quoted the *AE*.[783] Thus the *AE* was widely used, especially by academics. This was also true for Britain despite the poor sale of the *AE* there.

The letters of acknowledgement suggest that the *AE* was not only used in academic circles. Heber A. Longman, the director of the Queensland Museum in Brisbane wrote that the *AE* was 'in every-day use in our library' and that it was 'a boon to students and workers'.[784] Similarly, the Headmaster of the Canberra Grammar School told Robertson:

> *As a matter of fact now that it [the* AE, N.K.*] is in the Library I shall be able to keep my own copy in my study for I found that it was so much in demand both by Masters and our Senior boys that it was more often absent from my shelves than present when I needed it.*[785]

These and other quotes indicate that the *AE* may also have been used by young students and by less-educated people.[786] K.R. Cramp even claimed that the encyclopaedia was 'in practically every High School library in the State [i.e. NSW, N.K.].'[787] The *AE* was most likely also influential in an indirect way. The well-educated users of the *AE* were people with a great deal of influence: academics and other teachers, politicians influencing national and as well as international affairs, and booksellers and librarians deciding on what was available for reading. Through these readers, the *AE* may well have reached a broad audience in Australia and abroad.

---

[782] For fiction and historical narratives see for example: – Frank Clune, *Dig: A Drama of Central Australia*, 6th impression (Angus & Robertson, Sydney and London 1943) p. 277. – Robert Gibbings, *John Graham (Convict) 1824: An Historical Narrative* (Faber and Faber, London 1937) p. 135. – For political writing see for example: David M. Dow, *Australia Advances* (Funk & Wagnalls, New York and London 1938) p. 158. – See also: Australian War Memorial (ed.), *As You Were, 1946* (Australian War Memorial, Canberra 1946) p. 136. – Joseph Bryant, *Great Events in Australian History* (Cornstalk Publishing Company, Sydney 1925). (Bryant wrote in the preface (no page number indicated) to his book that he was indebted to 'Messrs. Angus & Robertson for making available the material they have collected for their forthcoming *Encyclopaedia of Australia*, a monumental work of quite national importance.') – Grace Hadley Fuller, *A Selected List of References on Australia* (Library of Congress, Washington 1942) p. 5. – Clive Turnbull, *Black War: the Extermination of the Tasmanian Aborigines* (F.W. Cheshire, Melbourne and London 1948) p. 235. – Clifford M. Zierer, 'Australia: the Physical Framework', *Geography of the Pacific*, Otis W. Freeman (ed.) (John Wiley & Sons, New York, and Chapman & Hall, London 1951) p. 117.
[783] Fred Johns, *An Australian Biographical Dictionary* (Macmillan & Co. Ltd., Melbourne 1934) p. 38.
[784] Letter from Heber A. Longman on 9 September 1927 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/243.
[785] Letter from W.J. Edwards on 4 March 1929 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.
[786] See for example also: Letter from the Secty. and Supply Officer of the NSW branch of the Prince of Wales Hospital (signature illegible) on 22 October 1926 to Angus & Robertson, ML: MS 314/243.
[787] Letter from K.R. Cramp on 4 September 1927 to Robertson, ML: MS 314/242.

Angus & Robertson's monument for the Australian nation was thus highly successful. The recognition that the *AE* was an advertisement for Australia did nothing to damage the encyclopaedia's reputation. The hole in the construction of the Australian nation was felt too strongly among the Australian elites to question the validity of the encyclopaedia. The *AE* managed to fill this gaping hole, and at the same time boosted the national self-confidence. Educated readers overseas seemed happy to receive knowledge on a country about which they knew very little. The *AE* was regarded as reliable, the air of objectivity of the encyclopaedic genre being effective. By using, spreading, and reproducing the encyclopaedia, the educated users of the *AE* made sure that the work remained influential for decades after its publication.

Conclusion

An examination of encyclopaedias has led to a reassessment of the Australian nation building process. Comparison of the *AE* with the *Dictionary* suggests that nation building, at least on a cultural level, became important earlier than has previously been assumed. Although the knowledge presented in Heaton's *Dictionary* does not exhibit the same saturation with national thought as the *AE*, it provides evidence for early nation building. Ostensibly a historical and biographical dictionary, Heaton's work has more the character of an inventory. It gauges the territory of the nation about to emerge, in a geographical as well as a cognitive sense. This statistical approach to presenting knowledge was characteristic of the nineteenth century and linked to the creation of new nation states requiring concrete means of imagining the national community. Thus one could argue that the *Dictionary*, written in the 1870s, is an indication that cultural nationalism was already becoming important before the 1880s. Heaton's work was distributed widely, and through a London edition even reached Britain where it earned the title 'the acknowledged standard work on Australia'. The *Dictionary*, bearing the stamp of objectivity attributed to encyclopaedias, probably had a wider influence than many other publications of the time.

Comparison of the *AE* with the *Dictionary* indicates how Australian nation building changed between the late 1870s and the 1920s. In the times of the *Dictionary*, nation building was still very much about defining what the imagined community consisted of geographically, historically, and above all demographically. In the eye of a person interested in nation building there seems to have been a great need to point out to Victorians or South Australians that they all belonged to the same community. Freeing this emerging nation from negative characteristics however was not yet on the agenda. As the *AE* suggests, in the 1920s, Australian nationalists still felt the need to work on the content of the imagined community – the geographical, geological, climatological, historical, political and economic maps were designed to make the Australian nation more concrete. In the 1920s, Australian nation building had reached a more intensive stage. Nationalism was not just about defining the nation, but also about selling this nation within Australia as well as overseas. To achieve such a goal the Australian nation had to be put in the best light possible. Nation building had become propaganda.

Nevertheless the thread linking Britain and Australia in the web of the British Empire was still strong in the 1920s. Comparison of the *AE* with *Chambers* demonstrates that the encyclopaedic knowledge production in the two countries cannot be fully untangled. The interconnections between the two encyclopaedias are manifest: British-Australian Jose, was heavily involved in the production of both works. In this respect, the *AE* resembled the *Dictionary*, published almost half a century earlier. Heaton had also lived a transnational life and nourished dual loyalties.

The entanglement of encyclopaedic knowledge production, as shown in the *AE* and *Chambers*, originated from the clear overlapping of Australian and British culture and values in the 1920s (and arguably much beyond those years). British general knowledge remained part of Australian general knowledge. Many subjects treated in the *AE* are British in origin, such as entries to do with sport and the church. The process of influencing, as postcolonial historians would have expected, went both ways: Australian general knowledge flowed back to Britain where it became incorporated into British general knowledge. Jose augmented the Australian knowledge included in *Chambers*, Australian knowledge becoming general knowledge. This promotion of Australian general knowledge remained limited since *Chambers'* producers did not succeed in detaching themselves from the British context.

Many lemmata in the two encyclopaedias do not fit national categories, such as 'Australian' or 'British'. A large number of the encyclopaedic entries, especially the biographical ones, are transnational. It is thus apparent that encyclopaedic knowledge production is transnational in character, the transmission of knowledge not knowing national boundaries. The *AE* was not an attempt to brush away the transnational spiderweb. Robertson and Jose were not able, even had they wished to, to sever Australia's ties with Britain. They seemed to have received advice from Chambers's editorial and publishing staff with gratitude. W&R Chambers might have been viewed by Angus & Robertson as a more experienced brother.

However, the *AE* indicated – as well as caused – significant and conscious changes in the symmetry of the web. The Australian knot was clearly given more weight through the production of the *AE*. Despite the fights, power struggles and the confusion about the exact relation between the *AE* and *Chambers*, the goal of the *AE* always remained clear to everyone involved: to create a work uniquely Australian, designed to

raise Australia's reputation both within and outside the nation. The knowledge presented in the *AE* distinguished itself from that in the *AE's* model *Chambers* as well as from that in its Australian precursor, Heaton's *Dictionary*. The Scottish encyclopaedia was ultimately only a model on a superficial level, to boost the *AE's* economic value. In contrast to both other encyclopaedias, the *AE's* ordering principle was national down to its very microstructure. Negatively connotated entries (such as were included in the *Dictionary*) and patronising or critical attitudes (such as displayed in some of *Chambers'* Australian articles) were taboo. Because of the implicit claim of encyclopaedias to be comprehensive, omitting negatively connotated entries meant that the *AE's* users were given the impression that the Australian nation had no negative aspects. The *AE's* entries are bursting with pride over Australian achievements and the wonders of its flora and fauna, supported by illustrations and maps of a nationalist character. The sources used for the production of the *AE* were predominantly Australian. Copying from *Chambers* was not on the producers' plan. Illustrations and maps were in many cases delivered by Angus & Robertson's own authors and their families.

With its praise of all things Australian, the *AE* provided its Australian users with a remedy for the ingrained anxiety that Australians might be inferior to the British. When this remedy is made explicit, such as in formulations where Australia is compared positively to Britain ('we are just as good as the British, if not better') the praise of Australia paradoxically becomes proof for the continuing dependence on Britain. Australia is praised in relation to Britain. Minds are not decolonised yet. Nevertheless, Angus & Robertson's transformation of an established genre, the Konversationslexikon, into a monument for the Australian nation shows that Australia was not passively taking over a cultural product from its former mother country, but creating something new. In this sense, one could call the production of the *AE* an appropriation of ideas to serve a new purpose.

Analysis of the letters of acknowledgement demonstrates that in academic and other well-educated circles in Australia and overseas, in particular in Britain and the United States of America, the *AE* was warmly welcomed. The correspondents did not limit the use of the *AE* to private purposes but also introduced the encyclopaedia to universities, schools and libraries. A wider audience gained access to the *AE* with its nation building effect. The *AE* was widely quoted until at least the middle of the twentieth

century in academic as well as fictional and political texts. Thus the knowledge presented was reproduced and disseminated beyond the already wide readership of the encyclopaedia itself.

The success of the *AE* indicates that Angus & Robertson hit the mainstream exactly. Since the *AE* was produced by a private company and not supported by the state, it had to tap into a widely felt need to be successful. That educated Australians had been waiting for a work like the *AE* is demonstrated by the numerous statements found in the acknowledgement letters that the *AE* was 'a much needed publication'. The *AE* 'proved' that Australians were capable of achievements in politics, art, literature, music, science, economy and more. The *AE* demonstrated that Australia's fauna and flora was not strange, but amazing and beautiful. The simple existence of the encyclopaedia was a cause for pride: just as the British had their *Britannica*, the Australians now had their very own *Australian Encyclopaedia*, a professional and technically advanced publication. The *AE's* pleasant look – its beautiful binding and its numerous artistic and high quality illustrations – as well as its readable content must have been beneficial to the *AE's* success too. Some educated Australians enjoyed the *AE* so much that the encyclopaedia even found its way into Australian Sunday and bedtime literature. The *AE* was not only an encyclopaedia and a national monument, but also a leisure pursuit.

A private company thus successfully contributed to filling the gap that the unusual founding of the Australian nation had left. Robertson and his editors Jose and Carter with their team of authors and illustrators made up for the lack of a unique Australian history and foundation myth by giving the Australian nation a positive biography in the shape of a Konversationlexikon. The absence of official architectural monuments reminding Australians of the foundation of their nation was made up for with a textual monument. Encyclopaedic communication of knowledge thus took on an important role in the ongoing Australian nation building process of the 1920s. Or to put it differently: the *AE* augmented the soft power of the Australian nation. Since the *AE* was constructed to further the Australian nation building process, it delivers evidence for Herren and Michel's thesis that encyclopaedias bloom in times of structural changes and upheavals.[788]

[788] See: Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 12.

The *AE's* nation building project was exclusive: the monument was only erected for the part of the population considered worthy of Australian nationhood. Australia's indigenous population and Asians, in particular the Chinese, were excluded, and women were marginalised. This exclusivity is nothing extraordinary – all nation building efforts are exclusive. However, defining the nation in the genre of the encyclopaedia meant that these views on the extent of the Australian nation were established as general knowledge. As Jose was well aware, the biography of the Australian nation was given the stamp of objectivity. Thus the *AE* not only supported the construction of an Australian national tradition, but at the same time legimitised the social and political consequences of the nation building process.

With an encyclopaedia, Angus & Robertson had chosen the ideal genre to convey their propaganda. Encyclopaedias reach the core of successful nation building by providing an interaction between society and construction. The organisation of the genre means that political ideas cannot only be conveyed through the content of the work, but also through its categorisation, affecting the perception of the reality portrayed. Of this, Angus & Robertson and their team took full advantage: the chosen knowledge was lemmatised and the individual articles arranged entirely along national lines. The fact that encyclopaedias are not intended to be read fully, meant that such a nationalist order seemed less pungent. Also the air of objectivity attached to the genre of the encyclopaedia worked in favour of Angus & Robertson's nation building project. Analysis of the letters of acknowledgement has shown that the intellectual elite regarded the *AE* as a reliable source of knowledge, providing accurate facts. The *AE's* high edition, characteristic for encyclopaedias, can only have benefited the intended spread of the political ideas.

Encyclopaedias are thus ideal vehicles for the exertion of political power. Important consequences flow from this insight. Historians cannot neglect encyclopaedias as a force within political history any longer. In the Australian context the question arises what had triggered the production of the next national (adult) encyclopaedia, the *Australian Encyclopaedia* of 1958.[789] Is it possible that this encyclopaedia answered a political need to convince the Australian population of another ingredient in the forging of its identity? Is it a coincidence that an Australian children's encyclopaedia was published

[789] A.H. Chisholm (ed. in chief), *The Australian Encyclopaedia* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1958).

in the same decade?[790] A comparison of Australian encyclopaedias over time, from Heaton's *Dictionary* to the encyclopaedias of the 21st century, might not only further demonstrate how Australian general knowledge changed with the society it was produced in, but also crystallize an active role encyclopaedias play in the continuing discussion on an Australian national character. Is there a link between encyclopaedias and the widespread preoccupation of politicians, journalists and ordinary citizens to define what makes up an Australian? It is startling to see how widespread the practice is to determine whether a specific behaviour is 'Australian' or 'Un-Australian'.

Recognising encyclopaedias' capacity for political propaganda is also significant for our society in a wider sense, and for education in particular. Encyclopaedias are far from dead. More and more encyclopaedias are presented in a digital form on the internet, among these modern encyclopaedias such as the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.[791] Modern society with its claim for equal education has led to an explosion of knowledge, visible on the internet, the largest encyclopaedic product of all times. The world wide web has among other things led to the phenomenon of Wikipedia.[792] This online encyclopaedia has most characteristics of traditional encyclopaedias, but Wikipedia's articles are not necessarily written by experts. They are subjected to a continuous public control. Not only can anybody contribute an entry to Wikipedia, but also most of the already existing entries can be changed by anyone with access to the internet.[793] This means that Wikipedia consists of a consensus reached by the society of internet users and that it is less in danger of being used for political purposes by an individual party, at least not on a long-term basis. However, Wikipedia is not censored, and individual entries – perhaps written with political goals in mind – may remain on the net for a considerable time until they are subjected to revision by the public eye.

Encyclopaedias with their capacity for political influence reach an ever broader audience all around the world. Connecting schools to the internet means that this audience increasingly includes teenagers and children. But how critical are students in their usage of the internet? The study *Informationsbeurteilungsfähigkeit* by members of the project 'Schulen ans Netz – was jetzt?' in Switzerland has shown that high school students in

[790] Charles Barrett (ed.), *The Australian Junior Encyclopaedia* (Georgian House, Melbourne 1951).
[791] www.britannica.com
[792] www.wikipedia.org
[793] There are exceptions to this rule. Some articles can only be edited by selected editors. With this policy, articles that are regarded as in danger of being vandalised are protected.

Zurich are not using the internet in a reflective way. Although the observed students were spending a great deal of time on the internet, and the majority named the internet as their preferred way of finding information, the majority was not able to judge the quality of the information found.[794] Complaints from academics that their students use the internet, including encyclopaedias, uncritically are frequent. Undergraduate students on a tertiary level often do not understand why they are not allowed to use encyclopaedias as secondary sources in their essay writing. Many students are not aware that the encyclopaedias' air of objectivity is an illusion, and that the encyclopaedias' anonymity and simplifying tendency makes these works unsuitable as academic sources. Since the political nature of encyclopaedias has not preoccupied academics until recently, it is not surprising that many of their students are not aware of it.

The capacity of encyclopaedias for political indoctrination demands an inclusion of encyclopaedic sources in the writing of political history. At the same time, it is necessary for teachers and academics to raise the level of critical thinking among their students towards encyclopaedias as well as the internet. As Herren and Michel said, the revelation of the myth of the encyclopaedia is long overdue.[795]

[794] Tobias Zimmermann, Viviane Kappes and Paul Michel, *Informationsbeurteilungsfähigkeit – Eine Pilotstudie an Zürcher Gymnasien* (Project Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft, URL: www.enzyklopaedie.ch, accessed 4 April 2007) p. 16.
[795] Michel and Herren, 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken', p. 58.

Bibliography[796]

Manuscripts

Mitchell Library (State Library of New South Wales) (ML): MS 314/12, Publishing Files of Charles Henry Bertie.

ML: MS 314/17, Publishing Files of Herbert James Carter.

ML: MS 314/41, Publishing Files of Arthur Wilberforce Jose.

ML: MSS 314/242 and 314/243, Angus & Robertson, Publishers, Correspondence (on Australian Encyclopaedia, 1925–1930).

ML: MS 3269; box 19; folder 42/2, Business Records of Angus & Robertson: Chamber's Encyclopaedia, 1902–1913.

ML: MS 5238, Rebecca Wiley, Reminiscences of George Robertson and Angus & Robertson Ltd. 1894–1938.

ML: UNCAT MSS SET 157; item 1, Papers of Charles Henry Bertie, Australian Encyclopaedia Article on Sydney with Duplicate Correspondence MSS and Notes.

ML: ZML A7273, Jose, Arthur Wilberforce and Carter, Herbert James: Files of Correspondence (17 letters), 1917–1925, as Editors of the 1925–1926 Edition of the Australian Encyclopaedia.

National Archives of Australia (NAA): Department of Home and Territories, Central Office; A1, Correspondence Files, Annual Single Number Series, 1890–1969; 1924/21464, Angus and Robertson's Encyclopedia of Australia: Information re Mt. Stromlo Observatory, 1924.

NAA: Official History, 1914–1918 War; AWM38, Records of Charles E W Bean, Official Historian, 1914–1963; 3, Correspondence, 1920–45, Regarding an Article for the 'Encyclopaedia of Australia', 1920–1945.

NAA: Official History, 1914–18 War; AWM39, Records of Arthur W Jose, 1910–1925;

3, Intelligence.

4, File 'C' – Miscellaneous.

6, Correspondence between A W Jose, Chambers' Encyclopedia, J M Dent and Others, 1910–1921.

National Library of Australia (NLA): MS 708, Letters and Papers Relating to the Publication of the Australian Encyclopaedia 1917–1928.

[796] It is not possible to distinguish clearly between primary sources and secondary sources, since some works have both functions.

National Library of Scotland (NLS): Dep. 341, W&R Chambers Papers; 166, 167, 178, 201, 381, 385, 386, 387, 391, 400, 444.

State Library of Victoria (SLVIC): PA 98/112, Jose, Arthur Wilberforce; boxes 1, 4, 5, 12. (not yet fully sorted or listed)

Other Unpublished Sources

Guide to the Angus & Robertson Archives. State Library of New South Wales, Sydney 2000.

Jones, Caroline Viera. *Australian Imprint: The Influence of George Robertson on a National Narrative (1890–1935)*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sydney 2004.

Meyer, Georg. *Das Konversations-Lexikon, eine Sonderform der Enzyklopädie: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bildungsverbreitung in Deutschland*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Göttingen 1965.

ML: Q 655.52/N, 'Copies of all Correspondence between the Government or its Officers and Mr. Heaton with Respect to the Printing and Publication of the Book Called "The Dictionary of Dates."', ordered by the Legislative Assembly to be Printed, 26 June, 1879, with 'Further Correspondence', ordered by the Legislative Assembly to be Printed, 10 July, 1879 (Parliament – NSW – Legislative Assembly, Correspondence (Heaton, Sir John Henniker), Australian Dictionary of Dates), part I and II, printed documents.

Pagliaro, Teresa. *Arthur Wilberforce Jose (1863–1934): An Anglo-Australian*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sydney 1990.

Published Sources

A., M. 'Names given by Cook' ('The Record'). *The Geographical Journal*, 111 (1/3), 1948. p. 143.

A., M. 'Rev. W.B. Clarke, the Australian Geologist' ('The Monthly Record'). *The Geographical Journal*, 108 (1/3), 1946. pp. 120–121.

Alomes, Stephen and Catherine Jones. *Australian Nationalism: a Documentary History*. Collins and Angus & Robertson, North Ryde (NSW) 1991.

Alomes, Stephen. *A Nation at Last? The Changing Character of Australian Nationalism 1880–1988*. Angus & Robertson, North Ryde (NSW) 1988.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. edn. Verso, London and New York 1991.

Andrews, B.G. and Ann-Mari Jordens. 'Broomfield, Frederick John (Fred) (1860–1941)'. *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. Australian National University, online edition 2006. (www.adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A070441b.htm, accessed 7 June 2007.)

Attwood, Bain. 'Introduction'. *Power, Knowledge and Aborigines*. Bain Attwood and John Arnold (eds.). La Trobe University Press, Bundoora (VIC) 1992. pp. i–xvi.

Australian War Memorial (ed.). *As You Were, 1946*. Australian War Memorial, Canberra 1946.

Baker, Sidney J. *The Australian Language*. Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1945.

Ballantyne, Tony. *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empir*e. Palgrave, Basingstoke and New York 2002.

Barker, Anthony W. *George Robertson: a Publishing Life in Letters*. University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) 1993.

Barrett, Charles (ed.). *The Australian Junior Encyclopaedia*. Georgian House, Melbourne 1951.

Battye, J.S. (ed.). *The Cyclopedia of Western Australia: an Historical and Commercial Review. Descriptive and Biographical Facts, Figures and Illustrations. An Epitome of Progress*. Hussey & Gillingham for the Cyclopedia Company, Adelaide 1912–1913.

Behrndt, Karsten. *Die Nationskonzeptionen in deutschen und britischen Enzyklopädien und Lexika im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*. Lang, Frankfurt am Main et al. 2003.

Berlioz, Jacques et al. 'Les Recueils d'Exempla et la diffusion de l'Encyclopédisme médiéval'. *L'enciclopedismo medievale*. Michelangelo Picone (ed.). Longo, Ravenna 1994. pp. 179–212.

Binkley, Peter (ed.). *Pre-modern Encyclopaedic Texts*. Proceedings of the Second COMERS Congress, Groningen 1996. Brill, Leiden, New York and Köln 1997.

Birrell, Robert. *Federation: the Secret Story*. Duffy & Snellgrove, Sydney 2001.

Birrell, Robert. 'A Nation of Our Own'. *Quadrant*, 39 (10), 1995. pp. 34–42.

Blair, David. *Cyclopaedia of Australasia, or, Dictionary of Facts, Events, Dates, Persons, and Places Connected with the Discovery, Exploration, and Progress of the British Dominions in the South, from the Earliest Dawn of Discovery in the Southern Ocean to the Year 1881*. Ferguson and Moore, Melbourne 1881.

Borchardt, D.H. and W. Kirsop. *The Book in Australia: Essays Towards a Cultural and Social History*. Australian Reference Publications, Melbourne 1988.

Bots, Hans J.A. (ed.). *Critique, savoir et erudition à la veille des Lumières: le* Dictionaire historique et critique *de Pierre Bayle (1647–1706)*. Actes du colloque international, Nimège, octobre 1996. APA-Holland University Press, Amsterdam 1998.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800–1930*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London 2003.

Brawley, Sean. '"Our Live-Savers": The Royal Life Saving Society and the Origins of Surf Life Saving in Federation Sydney'. *Sport, Federation, Nation*. Richard Cashman et al. (eds.). Walla Walla Press, Sydney 2001. pp. 139–164.

Broinowski, Alison. 'The Japanese in the Big Picture'. *Makers of Miracles: The Cast of the Federation Story*. David Headon and John Williams (eds.). Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 2000.

Bryant, Joseph. *Great Events in Australian History*. Cornstalk Publishing Company, Sydney 1925.

Burgess, H.T. (ed.). *The Cyclopedia of South Australia*. The Cyclopedia Company, Adelaide 1907.

Burnley, Ian H. *The Impact of Immigration on Australia: A Demographic Approach*. Oxford University Press, Melbourne 2001.

Büttner, Frank et al. *Sammeln, Ordnen, Veranschaulichen: Zur Wissenkompilatorik in der Frühen Neuzeit*. LIT Verlag, Münster 2003.

Cancik, Hubert and Helmuth Schneider (eds.). 'Enzyklopädie'. *Der Neue Pauly*. Vol. 3. Metzler, Stuttgart and Weimar 1997.

Cashman, Richard. *Sport in the National Imagination: Australian Sport in the Federation Decades*. Walla Walla Press, Sydney 2002.

Castles, Stephen et al. *Mistaken Identity, Multiculturalism, and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*. 3rd edn. Pluto Press, Sydney 1992.

'Celebrities at Home, Mr J. Henniker Heaton, M.P. in Eaton Square'. *The World*. 26 February 1890.

Chambarlhac, Vincent. 'L'Encyclopédie Socialiste, une forme singulière pour une cause politique?'. *Genèses: Sciences Sociales et Histoire*, 57 (4), 2004. pp. 4–22.

Chickering, Roger. '"Was ist Kulturgeschichte – und was ist sie nicht?" Über den Begriff der Kulturgeschichte in der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts'. *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 2, 1994. pp. 167–175.

Chisholm, A.H. (ed. in chief). *The Australian Encyclopaedia*. Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1958.

Clune, Frank. *Dig: A Drama of Central Australia*. 6th impr. Angus & Robertson, Sydney and London 1943.

Cole, E.W. *Cole's Commonwealth Handbook and Almanac for 1905: an Encyclopaedia of Figures and Facts about Australia*. E.W. Cole, Melbourne 1905.

Collison, Robert. 'Encyclopaedia'. *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Vol. 6. 15th edn. Benton, Chicago et al. 1984. pp. 779–799.

Collison, Robert. *Encyclopaedias: their History throughout the Ages*. A Bibliographical Guide with Extensive Historical Notes to the General Encyclopaedias Issued throughout the World from 350 B.C. to the Present Day. 2nd edn. Hafner, New York and London 1966.

Conrad, Sebastian and Shalini Randeria (eds.). *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus: Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*. Campus-Verlag, Frankfurt and New York 2002.

Conversations-Lexicon oder Handwörterbuch für die gebildeten Stände. 10th edn. Brockhaus, Leipzig 1852.

Coppola, Sylviane Albertan and Anne-Marie Chouillet (eds.). *La matière et l'homme dans l'Encyclopédie*. Actes du colloque de Joinville, 10–12 juillet 1995. Klincksieck, Paris 1998.

Coulthard-Clark, C.D. *The Citizen General Staff: The Australian Intelligence Corps 1907–1914*. Military Historical Society of Australia, Canberra 1975.

Cowlishaw, Gillian. 'Studying Aborigines: Changing Canons in Anthropology and History'. *Power, Knowledge and Aborigines*. Bain Attwood and John Arnold (eds.). La Trobe University Press, Bundoora (VIC) 1992. pp. 20–31.

Cranston, Maurice. 'Encyclopaedias: Theory and Practice'. *Encounter*, 31 (3), 1968. pp. 81–84.

Curthoys, Ann and Marilyn Lake. 'Introduction'. *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*. Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds.). ANU E Press, Canberra 2005.

The Cyclopedia of New South Wales (illustrated): an Historical and Commercial Review. Descriptive and Biographical Facts, Figures and Illustrations. An Epitome of Progress. The Cyclopedia Company, Sydney 1904.

The Cyclopedia of Tasmania: an Historical and Commercial Review. Descriptive and Biographical Facts, Figures and Illustrations. An Epitome of Progress. Business Men and Commercial Interests. Maitland and Krone, Hobart 1899–1900.

Dare, H.H. *Water Conservation in Australia*. Simmons Limited, Sydney 1939.

Davidson, Neil. *The Origins of Scottish Nationhood*. Pluto Press, London 2000.

Davison, Graeme. 'The Imaginary Grandstand: International Sport and the Recognition of Australian Identity'. *The Imaginary Grandstand: Identity and Narrative in Australian Sport*. Bernard Whimpress (ed.). Australian Society for Sports History, Kent Town (SA) 2002. pp. 12–26.

Davison, Graeme. 'Sydney and the Bush: An Urban Context for the Australian Legend'. *Historical Studies*, 18, 1978. pp. 191–209.

Day, Graham and Andrew Thompson. *Theorizing Nationalism*. Palgrave, Basingstoke and New York 2004.

Dieckhoff, Alain and Christophe Jaffrelot. *Revisiting Nationalism: Theories and Processes*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York 2005.

Docker, John. 'The Feminist Legend: A New Historicism?'. *Debutante Nation: Feminism Contests the 1890s*. Susan Magarey et al. (ed.). Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards 1993. pp. 16–26.

Docker, John. *The Nervous Nineties: Australian Cultural Life in the 1890s*. Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1991.

Donato, Clorinda. 'Eighteenth-Century Encyclopedias and National Identity'. *History of European Ideas*, 16 (4–6), 1993. pp. 959–965.

Dow, David M. *Australia Advances*. Funk & Wagnalls, New York and London 1938.

Einbinder, Harvey. *The Myth of the Britannica*. Johnson, New York and London 1972.

Encyclopaedia Britannica Online, http://www.search.eb.com.

Estermann, Monika. 'Lexika als biblio-kulturelle Indikatoren'. *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens*, 31, 1988. pp. 247–258.

Evans, Raymond et al. *1901, Our Future's Past: Documenting Australia's Federation*. Pan Macmillan Australia, Sydney 1997.

Eybl, Franz M. et al. (eds.). *Enzyklopädien der frühen Neuzeit: Beiträge zu ihrer Erforschung*. Niemeyer, Tübingen 1995.

Ferguson, George. *Some Early Australian Bookmen*. Australian National University Press, Canberra 1978.

Fletcher, Brian, H. *Australian History in New South Wales 1888 to 1938*. University of NSW Press, Sydney 1993.

Fuller, Grace Hadley. *A Selected List of References on Australia*. Library of Congress, Washington 1942.

Garis, B.K. de. ‘Heaton, Sir John Henniker (1848–1914)’. *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. Australian National University, online edition 2006. (www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A040421b.htm, accessed 25 September 2006.)

Garran, Andrew (ed.). *Picturesque Atlas of Australasia*. The Picturesque Atlas Publishing Company, Sydney 1886–88.

Gerloff, Wilhelm and Franz Meisel (eds.). *Handbuch der Finanzwissenschaft*. Vol. 3. Mohr, Tübingen 1928.

Gibbings, Robert. *John Graham (Convict) 1824: An Historical Narrative.* Faber and Faber, London 1937.

Giordano, Fausto. *Filologi e fascismo: Gli studi di letteratura Latina nell’* Enciclopedia Italiana. Arte Tipografia, Napoli 1993.

Gluck, Carol. ‘The Fine Folly of the Encyclopedists’, *Biblion*, 3 (1), 1994. pp. 5–48.

Grattan, C. Hartley (ed.). *Australia*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1947.

Grimshaw, Patricia et al. *Creating a Nation*. McPhee Gribble Publishers, Ringwood (VIC) 1994.

H., A.R. ‘Nautical Time and Civil Date’. *The Geographical Journal*, 86 (2), 1935. pp. 153–157.

Haechler, Jean. *L’Encyclopédie: les combats et les hommes*. Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1998.

Hancock, W.H. *Australia*. Ernest Benn Ltd., London 1930.

Haydn, Joseph. *Dictionary of Dates, and Universal Reference, Relating to All Ages and Nations, with Copious Details of England, Scotland, and Ireland, etc.* E. Moxon, London 1841.

Headon, David and John Williams (eds.). *Makers of Miracles: The Cast of the Federation Story*. Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 2000.

Heaton, John Henniker. *Australian Dictionary of Dates and Men of the Time.* S.W. Silver & Co., London 1879.

Heaton, John Henniker. *Australian Dictionary of Dates and Men of the Time: Containing the History of Australasia from 1542 to May, 1879.* George Robertson, Sydney 1879. (Electronic edition by Archive CD Books Australia, Modbury (SA) 2005).

Heaton, John Henniker. *The Bedside Book of Colonial Doings.* New edn. Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1984.

Heesen, Anke te. *The World in a Box: the Story of an Eighteenth-Century Picture Encyclopedia*. Chicago University Press, Chicago 2002.

Herren, Madeleine and Ines Prodöhl. 'Kapern mit Orangenblüten – die globale Welt der Enzyklopädie'. *Seine Welt wissen: Enzyklopädien in der Frühen Neuzeit*. Ulrich Johannes Schneider (ed.). Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 2006. pp. 42–53.

Heseltine, H.P. 'Introduction'. *The Australian Tradition: Studies in Colonial Culture*. A.A. Phillips. 2nd edn., reissue. Longman Cheshire, Melbourne 1980. pp. vii–xxii.

Hingst, Anja zum. *Die Geschichte des Grossen Brockhaus: Vom Conversationslexikon zur Enzyklopädie*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1995.

Hirst, John. *The Sentimental Nation: The Making of the Australian Commonwealth*. Oxford University Press, South Melbourne 2000.

Hoare, Michael E. (ed.). *The Resolution Journal of Johann Reinhold Forster 1772–1775*. Vol. 1. Hakluyt Society, London 1982.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 'Introduction: Inventing Traditions'. *The Invention of Tradition*. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1983.

Holroyd, John. *George Robertson of Melbourne 1825–1898: Pioneer Bookseller &* Publisher. Robertson & Mullens, Melbourne 1968.

Jackson, 'Towards a History of the Encyclopedia from Jerome to Isidor'. *International Library Review*, 13 (1), 1981. pp. 3–16.

Johns, Fred. *An Australian Biographical Dictionary*. Macmillan & Co. Ltd., Melbourne 1934.

Jose, Arthur Wilberforce. *The Romantic Nineties*. Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1933.

Jose, Arthur Wilberforce Jose and Herbert James Carter (eds.). *The Australian Encyclopaedia*. Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1925/26.

Joyce, Alfred. *A Homestead History: Being the Reminiscences and Letters of Alfred Joyce of Plaistow and Norwood, Port Phillip, 1843-1864*. With introduction and notes by G.F. James. Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1942.

Kaelble, Hartmut. 'Die Debatte über Vergleich und Transfer und was jetzt?'. *geschichte.transnational*. (URL: geschichte-transnational.clio-online.net/forum/id=574&type=artikel, accessed 21 December 04.)

Kafker, Franz A. *The Encyclopedists as a Group: a Collective Biography of the Authors of the Encyclopédie*. Voltaire Foundation, Oxford 1996.

Kendall, Timothy. *Ways of Seeing China: From Yellow Peril to Shangrila.* Curtin University Books, Fremantle 2005.

Kidd, Colin. 'Identity before Identities: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Historian'. *History and Nation*. Julia Rudolph (ed.). Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg 2006.

Knaplund, Paul. *The British Empire, 1815–1939*. Harper & Brothers, New York and London 1941.

Knibbs, G.H. (ed.). *Federal Handbook*. Government Printer, Melbourne 1914.

Lake, Marilyn. 'Introduction: the Past in the Present'. *Memory, Monuments and Museums: The Past in the Present*. Marilyn Lake (ed.). Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 2006. pp. 1–11.

Lake, Marilyn. 'The Politics of Respectability: Identifying the Masculinist Context'. *Historical Studies*, 22 (86), 1986. pp. 116–131.

Lamont, R. 'Jose, Arthur Wilberforce (1863–1934)'. *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. Australian National University, online edition 2006. (adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A090521b.htm, accessed 24 May 07.)

La Nauze, John Andrew. *Political Economy in Australia: Historical Studies*. Vol. B. Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1949.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*. Vol. 5. Eyre and Spottiswoode, London 1943.

Lawrence, Paul. *Nationalism: History and Theory*. Pearson Education, Harlow and New York 2005.

Lawson, Ronald. 'The 'Bush Ethos' and Brisbane in the 1890's'. *Historical Studies*, 15 (58), 1972. pp. 276–283.

Lawson, Sylvia. *The Archibald Paradox: a Strange Case of Authorship*. Penguin, Ringwood (VIC) 1987.

Lawson, Sylvia. 'Print Circus: the *Bulletin* from 1880 to Federation'. *Journalism: Print, Politics and Popular Culture*. Ann Curthoys and Julianne Schultz (eds.). University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) 1999. pp. 83–96.

Lee, Christopher. *City Bushman: Henry Lawson and the Australian Imagination*. Curtin University Press, Fremantle 2004.

Lenz, Werner. *Kleine Geschichte grosser Lexika*. Bertelsmann Lexikon-Verlag, Güthersloh 1972.

Leoussi, Athena and Steven Grosby. *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture and Ethnicity in the Formation of Nations.* Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh 2007.

Lucas, A.H.S. *The Animals of Australia: Mammals, Reptiles and Amphibians*. Whitcombe & Tombs, Melbourne 1909.

Lydekker, Richard et al. *The Concise Knowledge: Natural History*. Hutchinson, London 1897.

Lyons, Martyn and John Arnold (eds.). *A History of the Book in Australia, 1891–1945: a National Culture in a Colonised Market*. University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) and Portland (Or.) 2001.

Macintyre, Stuart. *A Concise History of Australia*. 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2004.

Macintyre, Stuart. 'The Fortunes of Federation'. *Makers of Miracles: The Cast of the Federation Story*. David Headon and John Williams (eds.). Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 2000.

Macintyre, Stuart. 'Prologue: Sport and Past Australasian Culture'. *Sport in Australasian Society: Past and Present*. J.A. Mangan and John Nauright (eds.). Frank Cass, London and Portland, Or. 2000. pp. 1–8.

Macintyre, Stuart and Julian Thomas. *The Discovery of Australian History 1890–1939*. Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1995.

Mackaness, George. *The Life of Vice-Admiral William Bligh*. Farrar & Rinehart, New York and Toronto 1931.

Mandle, W.F. 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century'. *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 59 (4), 1973. pp. 225–246.

Matthäus, Jürgen. '"Für alle Zeiten weiss": Einwanderungspolitik und nationales Selbstverständnis Australiens im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert'. *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 50 (4), 2003. pp. 294–315.

McCoy, Frederick. *Prodromus of the Zoology of Victoria: Or, Figures and Descriptions of the Living Species of all Classes of the Victorian Indigenous Animals*. John Ferres, Melbourne 1885/1890.

McLachlan, Noel. *Waiting for the Revolution: A History of Australian Nationalism*. Penguin, Ringwood (VIC) 1989.

McLean, Denis. *The Prickly Pair: Making Nationalism in Australia and New Zealand*. University of Otago Press, Dunedin 2003.

McLeod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York 2000.

Meaney, Neville. 'Britishness and Australian Identity: the Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography'. *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (116), 2001. pp. 76–90.

Meier, Christel (ed.). *Die Enzyklopädie im Wandel vom Hochmittelalter bis zur frühen Neuzeit*. Akten des Kolloquiums des Projekts D im Sonderforschungsbereich 231: Träger, Felder, Formen Pragmatischer Schriftlichkeit im Mittelalter (29.11.–1.12. 1996). Fink, München 2002.

Mellick, J.S.D. *The Passing Guest: A Life of Henry Kingsley*. University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia et al. 1983.

Mergel, Thomas. 'Überlegungen zu einer Kulturgeschichte der Politik'. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28 (4), 2002. pp. 574–606.

Michel, Paul. 'Ordnungen des Wissens: Darbietungsweisen des Materials in Enzyklopädien'. *Populäre Enzyklopädien: Von der Auswahl, Ordnung und Vermittlung des Wissens*. Ingrid Tomkowiak (ed.). Chronos, Zürich 2002. pp. 35–83.

Michel, Paul and Madeleine Herren (eds.). *Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft.* Akten des internationalen Kongresses über Wissenstransfer und enzyklopädische Ordnungssysteme, vom 18. bis 21. September 2003 in Prangins. Project Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft, URL: www.enzyklopaedie.ch, 2005.

Michel, Paul and Madeleine Herren. *Projektbeschrieb*. Project Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft, URL: www.enzyklopaedie.ch, accessed 21 Aug. 2005.

Michel, Paul and Madeleine Herren. 'Unvorgreifliche Gedanken zu einer Theorie des Enzyklopädischen: Enzyklopädien als Indikatoren für Veränderungen bei der Organisation und der gesellschaftlichen Bedeutung von Wissen'. *Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft*. Akten des internationalen Kongresses über Wissenstransfer und enzyklopädische Ordnungssysteme, vom 18. bis 21. September 2003 in Prangins. Paul Michel and Madeleine Herren (eds.). Project Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft, URL: www.enzyklopaedie.ch, 2005. pp. 1–66.

Middell, Matthias. 'Transnationale Geschichte als transnationales Projekt? Zur Einführung in die Diskussion'. *geschichte.transnational*. (URL: geschichte-transnational.clio-online.net/forum/id=57&type=artikel, accessed 17 December 04.)

Mittelstrass, Jürgen. 'Vom Nutzen der Enzyklopädie'. *Meyers enzyklopädisches Lexikon*. Vol. 1. Bibliographisches Institut, Mannheim 1971.

Mulvaney, D.J. and J.H. Calaby. '*So Much That Is New'. Baldwin Spencer, 1860–1929: A Biography*. University of Melbourne Press, Melbourne 1985.

Myers, Robin. 'Joseph Timothy Haydn, of *Dictionary of Dates* Fame: "A long and Laborious Life, Writing Chiefly for the Publishers"'. *The British Library Journal*, 5 (2), 1979. pp. 158–180.

Nile, Richard. 'The Australian Legend and its Discontents'. *Becoming Australia*. Richard Nile and Michael Peterson (eds.). University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) 1998.

Nile, Richard and David Walker. 'The Mystery of the Missing Bestseller'. *A History of the Book in Australia, 1891–1945: a National Culture in a Colonised Market*. Martyn Lyons and John Arnold (eds.). University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) and Portland (Or.) 2001. pp. 235–254.

Nye, Joseph. *Bound to Lead: the Changing Nature of American Power*. Basic Books, New York 1990.

Nye, Joseph. *Soft Power: the Means to Success in World Politics*. Public Affairs, New York 2004.

Oldfield, Audrey. *Woman Suffrage in Australia: a Gift or a Struggle?* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992.

Osterhammel, Jürgen. *Kolonialismus: Geschichte – Formen – Folgen*. 4th edn. Beck, München 2003.

Özkırımli, Unmut. *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism: A Critical Engagement*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke and New York 2005.

Pagliaro, Teresa. 'A. W. Jose and the *Australian Encyclopaedia*'. *A History of the Book in Australia, 1891–1945: a National Culture in a Colonised Market*. Martyn Lyons and John Arnold (eds.). University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) and Portland (Or.) 2001. pp. 42–49.

Pagliaro, Teresa. 'A.W. Jose and the Nineties: Living, Remembering, Constructing a Decade'. *The 1890s: Australian Literature and Literary Culture*, Ken Stewart (ed.). University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) 1996. pp. 313–327.

Pagliaro, Teresa. 'Jose's Contribution at Angus & Robertson's to the Australian Literary Tradition'. *History of Book Publishing in Australia Conference*. 30–31 October 1992, Papers. Anthony Robert Delves (ed.). Australian Centre, Melbourne 1993. pp. 1–5.

Patriarca, Silvana. *Numbers and Nationhood: Writing Statistics in Nineteenth-Century Italy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1996.

Patrick, David (ed.). *Chambers's Encyclopaedia: A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge*. W&R Chambers, Edinburgh 1908.

Patrick, David and William Geddie (eds.). *The Illustrated Chambers's Encyclopaedia: A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge*. New edn. W&R Chambers, London, Edinburgh and Sydney 1925–1927.

Phillips, A.A. *A.A. Phillips on the Cultural Cringe*. Melbourne University Publishing, Carlton (VIC) 2006.

Pirsson, Louis V. and Charles Schuchert. *Introductory Geology*. Wiley, New York and London 1924.

Porter, Rose Henniker. *The Life and Letters of Sir John Henniker Heaton*. John Lane, London and New York 1916.

Preece, Warren E. 'The Organization of Knowledge and the Planning of Encyclopaedias: The Case of the Encyclopaedia Britannica'. *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale*, 9 (3), 1966. pp. 798–818.

Prodöhl, Ines. '"Aus denen besten Scribenten": Zedlers *Universal-Lexicon* im Spannungsfeld zeitgenössischer Lexikonproduktion'. *Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert*, 29 (1), 2005. pp. 82–94.

Project Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft, URL: www.enzyklopaedie.ch.

Reed, Stephen Winsor. *The Making of Modern New Guinea*. The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia 1943.

Ribémont, Bernard. *Littérature et encyclopédies du Moyen Age*. Paradigme, Orléans 2002.

Robin, Libby. *How a Continent Created a Nation*. University of New South Wales Press, Sydney 2007.

Rose, J. Holland et al. (eds.). *The Cambridge History of the British Empire*. Vol. 7. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1933.

Russell, Roslyn and Philip Chubb. *One destiny!: the Federation Story – how Australia Became a Nation*. Penguin, Ringwood (VIC) 1998.

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. Knopf (distributed by Random House), New York 1993.

Sarkowski, Heinz. *Das Bibliographische Institut: Verlagsgeschichte und Bibliographie, 1826–1976*. Bibliographisches Institut, Mannheim, Wien and Zürich 1976.

Schlögel, Karl. *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit: Über Zivilisationsgeschichte und Geopolitik*. Hanser, München and Wien 2003.

Schultheiss, Friedrich. 'Bibliographische Anmerkungen zu einer Enzyklopädie und vier Lexika des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts (Ersch-Gruber, Brockhaus, Pierer, Meyer, Herder)'. *Die wissenschaftliche Redaktion*, 6, 1971. pp. 33–48.

Shann, Edward. *An Economic History of Australia*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1930.

Sheehan, Jonathan. 'From Philology to Fossils: the Biblical Encyclopedia in Early Modern Europe'. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64 (1), 2003. pp. 41–61.

Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Polity Press, Malden (Mass.) 2001.

Smith, James (ed.). *The Cyclopedia of Victoria: an Historical and Commercial Review. Descriptive and Biographical Facts, Figures and Illustrations. An Epitome of Progress*. The Cyclopedia Company, Melbourne 1903–1905.

Solomon, Eldra et al. *Biology*. Brooks/Cole, South Melbourne 2002.

Spearitt, Peter. 'Hughes, Sir Thomas (1863–1930)'. *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. Australian National University, online edition 2006. (www.adbonline.anu.edu/biogs/A090718b.htm, accessed 7 June 2007.)

Spencer, Albert Henry. *The Hill of Content: Books, Art, Music, People*. Angus & Robertson, Sydney 1959.

Spillman, Lyn. *Nation and Commemoration: Creating National Identities in the United States and Australia*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York 1997.

Spree, Ulrike. *Das Streben nach Wissen: Eine vergleichende Gattungsgeschichte der populären Enzyklopädie in Deutschland und Grossbritannien im 19. Jahrhundert*. Niemeyer, Tübingen 2000.

Stammen, Theo and Wolfgang E.J. Weber (eds.). *Wissenssicherung, Wissensordnung und Wissensverarbeitung*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin 2004.

Stewart, Ken. 'Introduction'. *The 1890s: Australian Literature and Literary Culture*. Ken Stewart (ed.). University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (QLD) 1996. pp. 1–26.

Stokes, Geoffrey (ed.). *The Politics of Identity in Australia*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and Melbourne 1997.

Stolz, Michael. *Artes-liberales-Zyklen: Formationen des Wissens im Mittelalter*. Francke, Tübingen 2004.

Summers, Anne. *Damned Whores and God's Police*. 2nd rev. edn. Penguin Books, Camberwell (VIC) and London 2002.

Suter, Geraldine (chief indexer). *The Argus Index 1870–1879*. John Hirst (ed.-in-chief). La Trobe University, Melbourne 2005. (www.nla.gov.au/apps/argus, accessed 12 October 2006.)

Tomkowiak, Ingrid (ed.). *Populäre Enzyklopädien: Von der Auswahl, Ordnung und Vermittlung des Wissens*. Chronos, Zürich 2002.

Turnbull, Clive. *Black War: the Extermination of the Tasmanian Aborigines*. F.W. Cheshire, Melbourne and London 1948.

Turner, Frederick Jackson. *Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*. E.E. Edwards (ed.). University of Wisconsin Press, Madison 1938.

Tyrrell, Ian. 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History'. *The American Historical Review*, 96 (4), 1991. pp. 1031–1055.

Vogelsang, Klaus. ‘Zum Begriff “Enzyklopädie”’. *Wissenssicherung, Wissensordnung und Wissensverarbeitung*. Theo Stammen and Wolfgang E.J. Weber (eds.). Akademie Verlag, Berlin 2004. pp. 15–23.

Walker, David et al. (eds.). *Books, Readers, Reading*. Deakin University, Geelong (VIC) 1992.

Ward, John Manning. *The State and the People: Australian Federation and Nation-Making, 1870–1901*. Deryck M. Schreuder and Brian H. Fletcher (eds.). Federation Press, Sydney 2001.

Ward, Russell. *The Australian Legend*. Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1958.

Watson, Fredk (ed.). *Historical Records of Australia*. Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, Sydney 1914–1925.

Welsh, Frank. *Great Southern Land: A New History of Australia*. Allen Lane, London 2004.

Werner, Michael and Bénédicte Zimmermann. ‘Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung: Der Ansatz der *Histoire croisée* und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen’. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28 (4), 2002. pp. 607–636.

Wetscherek, Hugo et al. (ed.) *Bibliotheca lexicorum: kommentiertes Verzeichnis der Sammlung Otmar Seemann*. Eine Bibliographie der enzyklopädischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der im deutschen Sprachraum ab dem Jahr 1500 gedruckten Werke. Inlibris, Wien 2001.

White, Richard. *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688–1980*. George Allen & Unwin, Sydney 1981.

Wickens, Chas. H. *Official Yearbook of the Commonwealth of Australia*. No. 18. John Stonham (ed.). Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Melbourne 1925.

Wolfe, Patrick. ‘History and Imperialism: A Century of Theory, from Marx to Postcolonialism’. *The American Historical Review*, 102 (2), 1997. pp. 388–420.

Woolf, Stuart. ‘Statistics and the Modern State’. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31 (3), 1989. pp. 588–604.

Woollacott, Angela. ‘Postcolonial Histories and Catherine Hall’s *Civilising Subjects*’. *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*. Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds.). ANU E Press, Canberra 2005. pp. 64–73

Yeo, Richard. *Encyclopaedic Visions: Scientific Dictionaries and Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001.

Yeo, Richard. ‘Reading Encyclopedias: Science and the Organization of Knowledge in British Dictionaries of Arts and Sciences, 1730–1850’, *Isis*, 82 (311), 1991. pp. 24–49.

Yeo, Richard. ‘A Solution to the Multitude of Books: Ephraim Chambers’s Cyclopaedia (1728) as “The Best Book in the Universe”’. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64 (1), 2003. pp. 61–72.

Young, Robert. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Blackwell, Oxford 2001.

Zelle, Carsten. *Enzyklopädien, Lexika und Wörterbücher im 18. Jahrhundert*. Wallstein-Verlag, Wolfenbüttel 1998.

Zierer, Clifford M. ‘Australia: the Physical Framework’. *Geography of the Pacific*. Otis W. Freeman (ed.). John Wiley & Sons, New York, and Chapman & Hall, London 1951. pp. 89–117.

Zierer, Clifford M. ‘The Australian Iron and Steel Industry as a Functional Unit’. *Geographical Review*, 30 (4), 1940. pp. 649–659.

Zierer, Clifford M. ‘Broken Hill: Australia’s Greatest Mining Camp’. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 30 (2), 1940. pp. 83–108.

Zimmermann, Tobias, Viviane Kappes and Paul Michel. *Informationsbeurteilungsfähigkeit – Eine Pilotstudie an Zürcher Gymnasien*. Project Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft, URL: www.enzyklopaedie.ch, accessed 4 April 2007.

Zischka, Gert A. *Index Lexicorum: Bibliographie der lexikalischen Nachschlagewerke*. Hollinek, Wien 1959.

Curriculum vitae

EDUCATION

2003–2007:
PhD in History at the University of Zurich, Switzerland. January 2005 to November 2006: Visiting Research Associate at the University of New South Wales, Sydney.

March and April 2006:
Completed the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Sessional Teaching Staff Learning and Teaching Workshop Program at UNSW.

1996–2002:
Licentiata Philosophiae with General History Major at the University of Zurich. Title of the thesis: *Schwedische Reiseberichte aus dem Krieg: Deutschland 1914–1918 (Swedish Travelogues From the War: Germany 1914–1918).* Other subjects studied: German Linguistics and Literature, Swedish language. Exchange semester at the University of Stockholm, Sweden (January to June 2000).

EMPLOYMENT

Since July 2007:
Research assistant for Prof. Ian Tyrrell at UNSW.

Since March 2007:
Tutor for Dr. Diane Collins in Historical and Cultural Studies at the Conservatorium of Music, Sydney.

2006:
Tutor for Associate Professors Raelene Frances and Bruce Scates in the course *The Fatal Shore: Aborigines, Immigrants and Convict Society* at UNSW.

REFEREED PUBLICATIONS

Hagen (maiden name), Nadine. 'A Mind-Map of a Nation: the Australian Encyclopaedia or Why Sharks Are More Important than Tigers.' *Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft: Akten des internationalen Kongresses über Wissenstransfer und enzyklopädische Ordnungssysteme, vom 18. bis 21. September 2003 in Prangins.* Eds. Paul Michel, Madeleine Herren and Martin Rüesch. Shaker Verlag, Aachen 2007.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

'Historiography in the Australian Encyclopaedia.' (13th AHA Biennial National Conference, Canberra, July 2006).

'Organising Knowledge as a Political Statement.' (20th International Congress of Historical Sciences, Sydney 2005). (Refereed).

	‘A Mind-Map of a Nation.’ (International congress ‘All You Need to Know’, Prangins, Switzerland, 2003). (Refereed).
GRANTS	‘Salomon David Steinberg-Stipendien-Stiftung’, Switzerland, in support of PhD thesis (awarded 2006).
	Scholarship ‘Forschungskredit’ from the University of Zurich in support of PhD thesis (awarded 2003).
LANGUAGES	German (mother tongue), English (fluent), Swedish (fluent), French (fluent), Italian (fluent), Latin (high-level knowledge).